THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. X FEBRUARY, 1925 No. 56

EDITORIAL

"CHRISTUS VERITAS" AND OTHER BOOKS

In *Christus Veritas** the Bishop of Manchester has given us a powerful and compact philosophical statement of the Catholic Faith. Neglect of philosophy is one of the charges most often brought—and not without reason—against Anglican theology. The Roman Church far outstrips us in the attention given to it in the training of their clergy; while it only too often happens that when philosophers turn theologians in this country, it is at the expense of large and vital elements in Christian dogma. This is not so with Bishop Temple. He is equally at home in philosophy and in theology; and those who desire to see the Christian revelation of God and man set forth in relation to the rest of our experience and knowledge will read his book with profound gratitude.

The Bishop is a Platonist; and it looks as though the growth of Neo-Scholasticism, which is a marked feature of modern Roman Catholic thought, might be matched by a growth of Neo-Platonism in the Church of England. Platonism has an astonishing habit of revival, and of expressing itself through minds of very different build and temper. Thus, the Bishop of Manchester and the Dean of St. Paul's do not in many ways closely resemble one another; yet Plato speaks through them both. So striking, indeed, is the parallelism of thought that it would be easy to exhibit it in tabular form, by comparing passages from *Christus Veritas* with others from Dr. Inge's Gifford Lectures, entitled *The Philosophy of Plotinus*, in the way familiar to students of the synoptic problem; and higher critics might discuss whether the later writer has borrowed from the earlier, and if so, whether consciously or unconsciously, or whether to both (as we believe) Platonism is simply the common Q.

* Macmillan and Co., 1924. 10s. net.

Dr. Temple describes his system as a "sacramental philosophy." The structure of Reality is built up of a number of *strata* or grades—Matter, Life, Mind, Spirit—each of which, while dependent for its existence upon those below, only reaches its own completeness and actualization, and so only becomes intelligible, in the grade or grades above. The highest of these grades is that of Value, which "is the element in real things which both causes them to be and makes them what they are" (p. 15). Value, that is to say, is the modern name for what Plato called "Idea" or "Form," and what the Schoolmen called "Substance." And Dr. Temple insists that Value is prior to Existence, of which it is "the secondary ground," being the object of the creative Will of God.

From the principle that each grade in the scale of being only reaches its true end when taken up into a higher grade, which yet continues to use the lower grade for its own expression, it follows that humanity only becomes truly itself, and is able to be known as such, when it is taken up into God. So is the way open for the Incarnation, which alone makes sense of human life. And this fact will govern our attempts at Christology. "If in Jesus Christ God lived a human life for the purpose of inaugurating His kingdom, that is an event which marks a new stage as truly as the first appearance of life or the first appearance of Man. Therefore the theory or doctrine of the Person of Christ will not be found by merely stating His nature and works in terms of God and Man, but will involve restating God and Man in terms of the revelation given in Him" (p. 127). Dr. Temple has some illuminating criticisms to make of the *Kenosis* doctrine, of which he says that "the difficulties are intolerable. What was happening to the rest of the universe during the period of our Lord's earthly life?" (p. 142). The alternative is to believe that "God the Son did indeed most truly live the life recorded in the Gospel, but added this to the other work of God." To the objection that this is to make the Incarnation episodic, he replies that it is to make it not a *mere* episode in the Life of the Son, but a *revealing* episode. This clear testimony to our Lord's pre-existence and Deity is accompanied by an equal emphasis upon His Humanity; and Dr. Temple illustrates his view of the limitations which this involved in our Lord's knowledge and power during His Incarnate Life by a long quotation from Bishop Knox.

The principle which opens the way for the Incarnation opens it likewise for the place of the Sacraments in the Christian life. Baptismal Regeneration is the transference of a human being

from purely "natural" relationships into that network of influences flowing from Christ which constitutes the Church. The Eucharist is a sacrifice, in that "we, by repeating and so identifying ourselves with His sacrificial act, become participants in His one sacrifice, which is the perfect dedication to the Father of the Humanity which God in Christ has taken to Himself." Here perhaps we could wish for some expansion. The statement of the doctrine of the Real Presence is lucid and definite. "By means of the elements Christ is Present, that is, accessible." "The elements come by the act of Consecration to be the vehicle to us of His Human Nature and Life." In a detached note Dr. Temple deals with the exegesis of the words of Institution—"This is my Body," "This is my Blood of the New Covenant"—and considers the terms Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation; suggesting himself that the term Convaluation meets the case. "The Bread still has the value of Bread; it has also the value of the Body of Christ."* This interpretation involves "symbolism"; but "in the physical universe symbolism is the principle of existence."

Sufficient has been said to indicate that *Christus Veritas* is a book which deserves to be widely read. It does not yield up its secrets easily, and the cursory reader is likely to miss the impressive unity and coherence which pervade it. It is a book to add to one's library and use as a focus of study. So used, it will be found to throw the Light of Christ upon many types of experience and many issues of thought.

All who use the New Lectionary, and especially clergy who read the Lessons to the congregation every Sunday, will be grateful to Dr. Furneaux, formerly Dean of Winchester, for his *Introductions to the Lessons of the Lectionary*,† recently published. It consists of short analyses or summaries of the Lessons appointed for every day in the year. So far as we know, it is the only book of its kind which exists, and it is sure of a welcome. In some cases it will probably be found that these notes presuppose a degree of knowledge in the congregation which does not, in fact, exist, and omits, therefore, certain points which would need to be brought out. But, even where that is so, the parish priest or lay-reader will find them valuable. He may require to supplement the note, or to invert its order; but he will find its substance always helpful. Indeed, we do not expect that Dr. Furneaux would wish his book to be too

* For an elaboration of this position reference may be made to the present writer's discussion in *The First Book of the Irenicum of John Forbes of Corse*, appendix ii.

† Warren and Son, Winchester. 7s. 6d. net.

mechanically used. One or two illustrations of his method must here suffice. Thus we have for the Friday after the Ninth Sunday after Trinity:

Evensong: Second Lesson (*Matthew* xxv. 31-*end*).

A description of the Last Judgment. Christ is the representative of humanity, and what men do, or fail to do, to one another, they do, or fail to do, to Him.

It would be hard to compose a more pithy summary.

Or this, for the Sunday after Christmas:

Evensong: First Lesson (*Isaiah* xl. 12-*end*).

The Prophet describes the glory and omnipotence of God, so unlike the idols which men's hands fashion; infinitely above all finite spirits; beside whom the great ones of earth are insignificant; and yet not above the tenderest care for His chosen people.

Sometimes, as on the First Lesson at Mattins on the Monday in the second week after the Epiphany, Dr. Furneaux permits himself a short treatment of the literary problems of the book about to be read.

We will close with one suggestion. It is that Dr. Furneaux should follow up this book with an abbreviated edition containing those analyses which apply to the Lessons for Sundays and Holy Days only. Such a book would be much smaller, and would quickly find a home on the lecterns of our parish churches. There are certain cases, too, as in the First Lesson at Mattins on the last Sunday after Trinity, where detailed explanation of particular phrases—perhaps no more than a suggested re-translation—would be of great assistance.

The first volume of Dr. Moffatt's new translation of the Old Testament covers the books from Genesis to Esther, and is a very striking piece of work,* full of character and courage. This appears both in the method and in the style. The method is distinguished by a device for which students of the historical books will be very grateful to the translator; for by the use of italics and square brackets and a combination of these he has made clear at a glance which passages are attributed to the various sources, "J.," "E.," etc. This will effect a great saving in the use of reference books, and prove a boon to readers. Again, he has marked the difference between the Divine Names which are used in the original by translating "Yahweh" by "The Eternal." This is perhaps a more questionable policy; but usage alone will enable us to decide how far Dr. Moffatt's

* *The Old Testament*, a New Translation, by James Moffatt, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d. net. The second volume has reached us when this was in proof; we shall recur to it in a later number.

decision was the right one. It is probably the style, however, which will receive the most careful scrutiny; and here we can at once congratulate Dr. Moffatt upon having produced an English version which, while freshly translated from the Hebrew, yet preserves the simplicity and purity of diction which we associate with the early seventeenth century. Not only is the language Saxon with scarcely an admixture of Latin; but the structure and collocation of the sentences exhibits a rare combination of terseness and movement, due partly to the sparing use of particles. Let us instance 1 Sam. xv. 29:

A.V.

And also the Strength* of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man that he should repent.

Dr. Moffatt.

The splendour of Israel, he will never lie nor change his mind; he is not a man, to change his mind.

Or this from the opening passage of Jacob's Blessing in Gen. xlix. 1, 2.

A.V.

Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the last days. Gather yourselves together, and hear, ye sons of Jacob; and hearken unto Israel your father.

Dr. Moffatt.

"Gather," he said, "that I may tell you what is to befall you in after days.

"Sons of Jacob, gather round, hark to Israel your sire!"

It must not be supposed, of course, that all the changes are for the better; that, indeed, would be too much to expect. There are cases where we cannot understand why Dr. Moffatt failed to scent the perfection in the old version. It was a pity, we think, to alter the "Thou" of the Decalogue into "You"; and the lyrical form did not require that "Thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women," should become "Your love for me was a wonder, far beyond a woman's love." Where the choice is between a slightly clearer meaning and a perfect and familiar cadence, we think that the cadence should be kept. Thus the closing words of David's lament for Absalom are surely perfect as they stand—"Would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son"—and there is great loss when we read, "Oh that I had died instead of you, Absalom, my son, my son." In one or two instances the loss is even more disastrous; as when "only be firm and brave" supersedes the fair words, "Be strong and of a good courage." But no doubt Dr. Moffatt counted the cost, when he set about his task, and reckoned that he would receive objections on particular points. Let us only add that these objections do not prevent his book being a notable contribution to the religious literature of our time.

---

* Mg. Or, *Eternity*, or, *Victory*.

Mr. Haines's *Heathen Contact with Christianity during Its First Century and a Half** is a complete and carefully compiled collection of all the passages from Greek and Roman writers of the period in question which contain allusions to Christianity. The original Greek or Latin and the English translation are given on opposite pages; and the passages are preceded by a scholarly Introduction giving some account of each author quoted. Two sections are appended at the close of the book, one of Doubtful Allusions to Christianity, the other of passages illustrating the Jewish attitude to the new religion; the original languages only being given in these cases. We know of no book of documents which fulfils quite the same function as Mr. Haines's, and it meets a real need. The author has kept abreast of the latest classical, historical, and theological learning, and students can trust him as a reliable guide on the subjects of which he treats.

The Bishop of Gloucester has essayed a formidable task in taking as the subject of his Primary Visitation Charge the Church of England.† He declares its purpose to be twofold: (1) " to investigate and define the position of the Church of England," (2) " to give directions and advice to the clergy of the Diocese on questions of doctrine, worship, and policy which are before us at the present time." Inevitably the two strands intertwine a good deal, and not merely with one another, but round a third strand, namely, History. It is in the unfolding history of the English Church and not in the realm of formal theory that its peculiar position and principles are most clearly discerned; while it is precisely such " directions and advice " as the Bishop here addresses to his Diocese, together with the situations which elicited them, that have made that history what it is. The Church of England is in nothing more " national " than this—in nothing more expressive of the people whose civic Constitution was never framed in words. At the same time this treatment has its limitations. History, which is an unfinished process and, where finished, only partially known, cannot unlock all secrets. On some important matters, such as the nature and functions of Religious Authority, for instance, it can open up no more than one side of the truth. Nevertheless, the historical method has great advantages. It enables us to see the English Church in its organic development; to note how the growth now of this organ and now of that has been overtaken by, and integrated in, the proportion of the whole Body —in other words, how Freedom and Authority have been com-

* Deighton, Bell and Co. 3s. 6d. net.

† *The Church of England*, by the Right Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester. John Murray, 1924. 12s. net.

bined, in life rather than in theory; and to trace its continuous identity through ever-changing relations with other parts of Christendom, with the State, and with the needs of an expanding and progressive people. A reviewer in a recent number of the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* (Louvain) speaks of the Church of England as "perishing for lack of the power to define itself." Were the Church an artificial society or institution, such a criticism might have force. But if the true nature of the Church is best conveyed in the ideas of a Body, an organism, an "Israel of God," precise verbal definition will not be a primary condition of vitality. Its primary evidences will lie in its power of assimilation, adjustment, growth, and the mastery of its intellectual and social environment. To the furnishing of these evidences Dr. Headlam's book makes a valuable contribution.

Where Dr. Headlam deals with current issues of Church life, such as Sunday Services, Reservation, Vestments, etc., he deals with them sympathetically, though his conclusions do not always enlist our agreement. This is especially so in the matter of Reunion. We regret that the Bishop should regard the mutual recognition of Orders as a *sine quâ non* of Reunion, as it seems to us to be beginning at the wrong end. The question of the validity of Orders is largely a technical one. To say that Orders are invalid means that they are insecure and their title uncertain. You do not remove the insecurity by saying that it does not exist, but by removing the ground of it. As between the Easterns and ourselves there is good hope that the progress of learning alone may do this; and this is not inconceivable in the case even of Rome. But if either of these older Communions should hold, when all other difficulties had been removed, that there was still a doubt left there, we cannot think that we should refuse conditional re-ordination for ourselves in view of the great prize of Unity. And that is what we should be bound to ask of the Protestant Communions, where obviously the doubt as regards the security of their Orders is of a much more far-reaching kind.

---

*After the War** is the title which the Bishop of Southwark has given to Three Charges addressed to the Clergy of his Diocese in the autumn of the year just ended. The problems dealt with are respectively Faith, Morals, and Society. They are eminently practical and sympathetic, and represent the fruit of long pastoral experience; and the price will bring them within the reach of a large circle of readers.

* *After the War:* Three Charges, by Cyril, Bishop of Southwark. S.P.C.K. 1s. net.

THE GOSPEL OF LIFE: A STUDY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

VII.—THE FELLOWSHIP OF SACRIFICE

THE story of the healing of the man born blind begins abruptly, with no indication of time. The mention of the Feast of Dedication in x. 21, as the time of the discussion which follows, is apparently made to account for the place where the discussion took place, the covered colonnade of Solomon's porch being a natural shelter in winter. But the date is probably also retrospective, and the story of the blind man, the discourse of the Good Shepherd, and the controversy which follows the mention of the feast, seem to be intended to be read as one continuous record. We accordingly take the two chapters as describing a visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Dedication, though perhaps we can hardly lay stress on any connection of thought between the feast and the discourses recorded.

The only immediate link of connection with the story of the Feast of Tabernacles is our Lord's reference to Himself as the light of the world, which gives the motive principle of the healing of the blind man. Light must give light. The opposition is no longer between light and darkness, but between light and blindness, and the actual physical blindness of the man healed is contrasted with the wilful spiritual blindness of the Pharisees.

Our subject does not call upon us to dwell on the astonishingly vivid and dramatic story of the controversy between the blind man and his parents on the one side and the Pharisees on the other, or on the incisive character sketch of the blind man, a picture of the spirituality of common sense. But the concluding controversy with the Pharisees marks an epoch in the story of the ministry to Jerusalem, a stage in the judgment on "the Jews." On the one hand, it is the record of the final judgment passed on the representatives of the official religion—"Your sin remaineth." The sin is the sin which reveals itself as blindness when it comes into the presence of the light, the outcome of self-confident pride, self-absorbed, self-satisfied, merciless. And the judgment is the judgment of blindness, not the less but the more judicial blindness because it is blindness self-imposed. On the other hand, it is an epoch in our Lord's teaching at Jerusalem. It is as though the casting out of the blind man, a virtual if not a formal excommunication

from the commonwealth of Israel, set him free to dwell on the tender bond that binds the members to their head in the new fellowship of the redeemed to which the blind man is admitted.

The series of picture teachings—call them parables, allegories, figures, what we will—really all lead to one point, the tie that binds the sheep to the shepherd, and the revelation behind this of the bond that binds the Son to the Father.

Familiar passages from the Old Testament flit through our minds as we read; the language of the prophecy of Ezekiel xxxiv. against the shepherds of Israel, "The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost, but with force and with rigour have ye ruled over them." And again, "As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day when he is among his sheep that are scattered abroad, so will I seek out My sheep, and I will deliver them out of all places whither they have wandered in the cloudy and dark day." And, again, the figures of the twenty-third Psalm seem to recur, the shepherd who maketh the sheep to lie down in green pastures, who leadeth them beside the still waters, and guideth them in right paths, and as they pass through the dark valley defends them by his rod and his staff from the beasts of prey that lie in wait for them. And, again, the picture of David the boy-shepherd who, in defence of his sheep, faced and slew the lion and the bear. But beyond all the Old Testament thoughts which seem to be present to the mind and heart of the speaker is the deeper thought of the bond between the shepherd and the sheep.

It is to this thought that we are led by the generalized parable with which the discourse opens. The shepherd of the sheep is distinguished from the thief or the robber. He enters by the door. He calls his own sheep. He leads them out. He goes before them and they follow him, for they know his voice.

And then, as though His hearers asked, What is the door? He varies the figure and says again, "I am the door." It is the character and motive of the shepherd which is the mode of entry and approach to the sheep, and which wins them to listen to His voice. He is the door, by which they enter in and find safety, by which they go out and find pasture. The thief comes to destroy. The Shepherd is He who says, "I am come that they may have life, and may have it abundantly."

And so the figure changes again. "I am the Good Shepherd," and the character of the Shepherd is His self-sacrificing love. "The good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep." And the instinctive recognition of this love is what draws the

sheep to the Shepherd, "I know Mine own, and Mine own know Me."

And this love which binds the shepherd to the sheep is the same love which binds the Father to the Son, and the Son to the Father, the love which leads the Son to lay down His life for the sheep. In the self-sacrificing love of the shepherd for the sheep there is communion and fellowship between the Father and the Son.

And here, as elsewhere, the thought of the sacrifice leads Him to widen out His view to the other sheep, not of this fold, whom He will bring and who will hear His voice, the voice of His self-sacrificing love, and there shall be one flock and one Shepherd. The very ground of the love of the Father for the Son is the life-giving self-sacrifice of the Son. "Therefore doth the Father love Me, because I lay down My life that I may take it again." This is the mission of the Son. "This commandment have I received of My Father."

"I am come that they may have life, and that they may have it abundantly." We are still following out the principles of the Gospel of Life. The Good Shepherd is He who gives life. What are we learning of the life that He gives?

It is given by a close and intimate communion of spirit between the Shepherd and the sheep, who instinctively recognize in the Shepherd that He gives the food of life and salvation from the powers of evil. They instinctively recognize the love that gives life. But the life-giving love that they recognize is the self-sacrificing love of the Shepherd who lays down His life for the sheep.

And the instinctive sympathy of love with which they hear the Shepherd's voice, which draws them to follow Him, and makes them His own, is one with the love between the Father and the Son, that love which is the life of the Godhead, and in which the Father loves to give all to the Son, and the Son to depend in all on the Father.

And the self-sacrificing love, which the sheep instinctively recognize in the Shepherd, is itself the ground of that common mind of love between the Father and the Son in which they are one.

This unity between the Father and the Son is explicitly asserted in the controversy which follows the discourse.

The discourse of the Good Shepherd causes a division among the Jews. There are those who say, as they said before, that He is mad. There are others who are touched by the charm of the teaching, "These are not the sayings of one possessed by a devil." It is the voice of the former that we

hear from the Jews who come round about Him in Solomon's porch, and press for a conclusive answer to the question, Is He the Christ? Their question shows that they believe not. And they believe not because they are not of His sheep. They have not the instinctive sympathy with the self-sacrificing love of God manifest in Him. "My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me." And then, as though defying the influence of the spirit that spoke in their doubts, "I give unto them eternal life," that eternal life which is the knowledge of the Father, "and they shall never perish, and none shall snatch them out of My hand. It is the Father who has given them unto Me." It is by the love whose wellspring of life is in the Father that they have been won. He is greater than all. No power can snatch them out of the hand of the Eternal Love that rules the world. No one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand. He Himself in the power of His self-sacrificing love is present and manifest in the Son. "I and the Father are One."

So we reach the last word of the Gospel of Life, as preached to the Jews of Jerusalem. The truth which had from the first repelled the Jew, because he was not of one mind with the Father, is finally set forth in the full radiance of the manifestation of that mind as the mind of self-sacrificing love, drawing man to itself. And it is set forth, for them, in vain.

WILFRID RICHMOND.

(To be continued.)

DE RERUM NATURA (1925)

"Omne immensum peragravit mente animoque."—LUCRETIUS.

THE fundamental difference between modern thinkers and those who lived before the Renaissance and Reformation is in their conception of the relation of man to the physical world in which he lives. To this all other differences of thought and feeling and valuation can be traced back. It explains different relations to the Church, different starting-points, and different methods in philosophy, different estimates of the relative values of science, art, and theology, and, above all, a different emotional reaction to the universe. The great men of "the Golden Middle Age," St. Thomas Aquinas and Dante, felt the world as a "homely" place, created for man's sake by his Father in heaven. They did not find it difficult to relate the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Atonement to the pre-Copernican

philosophy of Nature. Between the philosopher and the scientist of 1425 and those of 1925 there is, however, a great gulf fixed, wider than five hundred years can measure, deeper than the Reformation has dug. The world has become terrifyingly vast, and man seems a thing of yesterday. Astronomy shrivels all human concerns to nothing. And biology and psychology, not to speak of newer and very speculative sciences, have taught us to trace the beginnings of all that we do and think and are and try to be in the lives and needs of animals and, even, of plants. The Incarnation and the Atonement are not so obviously natural against such a background. It is, at least at first sight, alien to Catholic theology. And it is the mental background of modern civilized men and women. As education becomes increasingly general, the people to whom the Church is called to minister will *assume* the picture of the universe which modern naturalism draws. The clergy cannot ignore it, even if they wish to do so. Natural Science cannot be dismissed with a few smart jokes, or treated as a part of the furniture of the modern mind which ought to make no difference to a man's religion. It is the task of theology in every age to present the Christian verity in such a way that it criticizes the thought and life of men, condemning the things that are false, bringing out, developing, commending, adapting itself to, and presenting itself as the crown and confirmation of, the things that are true and beautiful and good. It is the task of Christian philosophy to-day to teach Natural Science its place, and to do it reverently and gratefully. The object of this article is to present a picture of the physical universe, living and non-living, as modern science describes it, as detailed as space will allow, as accurate as the author's knowledge makes possible, in simple and non-technical language, and to show how such a view of the world must be related to philosophy in general, and to Catholic theology in particular. We shall deal with the non-living first; from an examination of the description of this we shall try to infer the limitations of the scientific method and point of view; with the help of the insight so gained we shall proceed to describe the world of life; and, last of all, we shall try to relate the philosophy of nature so built up to the theology of the Catholic Church.

I

It is not easy to imagine what the earth was like, just before life first appeared on it. There were no trees, of course, and no grass. The earth-worms had not begun to play their great part in crumbling up the soil. There was no chalk, or limestone, or marble. No coal. What made up the land-masses were

the mountains of igneous rocks, such as granite, and the layers of sediment, sand, clays, shales, slates, and so on, which have been produced through the destruction of the igneous rocks by the forces of the weather, air, water, frost, and lightning. It is possible that the continents were at one time much closer together than they are to-day, and that in the period before life began they formed one huge mass, surrounded by one vast ocean. One modern theory pictures the continents as masses of granite floating upon a sea of denser basalt, which lies below the floor of the world's oceans. It is, at any rate, a fact of observation that Greenland is moving away from Europe at a rate of about fifty feet in a year. If the continents have previously been joined, their separation probably took place long ago, in what geologists call the Tertiary epoch, perhaps before man first appeared on the earth.

Because life in its primitive forms was probably not adapted to resist direct sunlight, we are bound to assume that the earth, just before life began, was enveloped in clouds. This means, of course, that the atmosphere was filled with tiny particles of dust, on which the water was condensed which formed the clouds. The temperature of the oceans had cooled down to about 145° F., for no life can maintain itself at that temperature. Everybody realizes that the earth is gradually cooling, radiating off more energy into space than it receives from the sun. Since the discovery of radio-active elements it appears probable that this " cooling " of the earth has gone on much more slowly than nineteenth-century scientists believed, for, at the exceedingly high temperatures through which the earth has passed, an appreciable proportion of the energy radiated into space would be supplied from the dissociation of atoms; for it is not improbable that at high temperatures the atoms of many chemical elements are unstable, and exhibit phenomena similar to those of radium.

The earth is a mass, roughly a sphere, with a diameter of about 7,900 miles. The outer crust, relatively cool, is about fifty miles thick. The deepest shaft ever sunk was no more than about a mile and a half deep, a mere scratch when we remember that the centre of the earth is 4,000 miles beneath our feet. Our knowledge of the interior of the earth, most of the crust and all that is inside the crust, rests on inference and speculation. The study of volcanoes and earthquakes has, of course, been a great help here. It seems probable that the interior of the earth is not liquid, the pressure on it is far too great for that. It probably combines the properties of a very viscous liquid and a very strong solid which has been crushed by the weight above it and the pressure of the contracting crust

until it is very rigid indeed. The temperature of the centre of the earth is certainly below 16,000° F., and probably below 7,000° F.

It seems to be generally agreed that all the planets and their satellites were once united to the sun. The whole of the solar system was once a single mass of glowing vapour, revolving slowly and uniformly round its axis. As this mass cooled to form the sun, it gave off " knotted spiral nebulæ " under the attraction of passing stars; there may have been actual collisions, as a result of which strips of matter were ejected from the sun and broken up to form the planets. At first the sun was very far from the centre of the orbits of the planets, and when they passed near the sun its attraction caused the formation of moons. But this theory does not explain why the satellites of some of the planets have a retrograde motion, and why the two planets furthest from the sun rotate in an opposite direction from the others. Every alternative theory, however, leaves many things unexplained.

The history of the earth, once it began to be, is not quite clear. It began, probably, as a gas, and it is doubtful whether, as a whole, it was ever liquid. At some time, for some reason not yet fully understood, the moon was detached from the outer part of the earth. As the friction of the tides slows up the rotation of the earth, the moon moves further and further away from the planet. The earth, at first, had a diameter of about 5,500 miles. As a result of its drawing other matter into itself (meteorites, for example), it grew until its diameter was about 8,100 miles. Since then it has been cooling and consolidating internally, and its present diameter is about 7,900 miles. This theory was at one time generally accepted, but it seems probable that eventually a simpler account of the earth's development will be worked out.

A new theory as to the history of the stars (that is, of course, of the universe), including our sun, has recently been made public, and has received much attention, if only because of the mathematical and philosophical capacity of its author, Professor A. S. Eddington. It is assumed that a star began as a rarefied collection of comparatively cold matter. The particles fell towards each other by their own weight, and the star became denser and hotter. The theory postulates the dissociation of the atoms of the matter making up the star, which makes possible a continuous radiation of energy and loss of mass. The star, from its " birth " to its " death," would steadily decrease in brightness and in mass.

This means that the life-history of a star, and therefore of the universe, must be enormously longer than had been esti-

mated. Assuming Eddington's theory, Professor J. H. Jeans has calculated that the sun came into being about one hundred million million years ago. Many of the stars are much younger than this, but the majority of them are of approximately the same age. "A great outburst of creative activity took place at that remote time," and the universe as we know it to-day began to be. It is, perhaps, necessary to emphasize two points about these speculations. First, that they *are* speculations. They are guesses based upon observed fact; the mathematics used seems to be without mistakes; the results obtained do not contradict more observed facts than any other theory of the stellar universe; but, when all is said, they are guesses. Secondly, the statements of time only claim to be probably of "the right order of magnitude"; when a scientist says "one hundred million million years," he means "I think it is nearer to that than to ten million million years or to one thousand million million years." The universe is not infinite in time. One hundred million million years is a long time, measured by human standards, but it is not infinite. Chronology, however, has certainly changed since Ussher suggested B.C. 4004 for the Creation.

What is the world made of, or, as the old song says, "What can the matter be?" The spectroscope has made it quite certain that the sun and its planets and the stars are made up of the same substances as compose the earth: hydrogen, iron, sodium, and so on. In 1868 an element was discovered in the sun (hence it was named "helium") hitherto unknown on the earth. Later, its spectrum was observed in the light from many stars. But it was not until 1895 that helium was discovered on the earth. Such facts as these have made scientists quite certain that the universe is all made of the same stuff. We know what the stars are made of, and the old nursery rhyme has had to be re-written.

> "Twinkle, twinkle, little star,
> Now we all know what you are;
> Flames of soda, streaks of tin,
> Sulphuretted hydrogen."

Until about a generation ago it was believed by the generality of chemists that all known material substances, organic and inorganic, were made up of atoms of about seventy elements, which could not be further dissociated into any more simple substances, although it had, of course, been suggested that all the seventy elements were really made up of one element—for example, hydrogen. During the last forty years, however, an army of investigators, Crookes, Röntgen, the Curies, Sir J. J. Thomson, Rutherford, and a host of others, among whom

English-speaking workers hold an honourable place, have made it probable, by work on radium and on "rays" of different kinds, that we ought to think of all the elements as made up of atoms (which are, of course, submicroscopic in size), each of which is a system of particles in motion, comparable to the solar system, except for the fact that the atomic system is much more complex than the solar one. The dimensions of the nucleus of the atom are, it is thought, very small compared to those of the atom itself. It contains both positively and negatively charged electric elements, but the positive charges predominate. Surrounding this nucleus, in rapid motion and more or less stable equilibrium, are a number of electrons, probably negative charges of electricity—that number being equal to the resultant positive charges in the nucleus. Matter, then, as analyzed by the chemist and physicist, with the help of the powerful tools which modern mathematics puts into their hands, seems to be made up of charges of negative electricity in rapid motion (electrons), and the nuclei, which are made up of electrons and fundamental units, all alike, and positively charged. It all sounds strangely different to the solid tables and chairs, and the variegated beauty of flowers and birds, which are the material world we are accustomed to. But however far we get from "matter," and however near we get to "energy" by itself, we must not make the mistake of thinking that the natural scientist, with his balance and rule and stop-watch, can ever lead us across the line that separates the material from the mental. There is much loose thinking and writing on this point. Physical science, so long as it keeps to its own sphere, can never so much as touch the question whether the "cause" or "explanation" of the universe is or is not spiritual. It begins with matter and force in space and time, and there can be no more in the conclusion than there was in the beginning.

The subject of this digression will be dealt with more fully at a later stage. We have indicated the prevalent theories as to the constitution of matter, and the development of the universe. We have shown that there is reason to believe that the universe, at least as we know it at present, is not infinite in time, but is the result of a great "outburst of creative activity" at a definite point in the far distant past. There is also, and this is the next point to be considered, reason to believe that the universe is not infinite in space. There is a finite, not an infinite, number of heavenly bodies, such as stars, suns, planets, moons, and comets. For if the stars were distributed fairly regularly, and there were an infinite number of them, the whole heavens would shine with a bright light, because a star would be in every direction somewhere, at a greater or smaller

distance from the observer. Light, then, would seem to fill the whole sky, unless it be weakened or absorbed in cosmic space. There are, however, good grounds for asserting that light is *not* absorbed in space, and it follows that the universe of stars is a gigantic, but finite, accumulation which either *suddenly* ceases or gradually becomes very thin.

The question arises at once, Why, then, do the stars remain together? They are all moving with great velocities. Why do they not vanish into infinite space? As a matter of fact, there is no indication at all that the parts of the stellar universe are tending to separate.

The obvious answer to this difficulty, and the one that used to be given, is that *gravitation* holds the stars together. The universe is an example, and the supreme proof, of the fact that every existing particle of matter attracts every other particle of matter. But in the case of any ordinary gas we have an example, if the kinetic theory of gases be true, of what happens when we have a number of particles moving with great velocities irregularly in all directions. The pressure of a gas on the inside surface of the vessel which contains it is a demonstration of the fact that gravitation alone would not prove sufficient to prevent its particles separating indefinitely one from the other. We are forced by clear analogy, then, to conclude that the stars would tend to lose themselves in infinite space, getting ever further and further away from each other, *if space were itself infinite*. The fact that there is a *universe* at all means that space is finite. This conclusion is sufficiently startling, but it has to be faced. The universe is unimaginably old, but it does not occupy infinity in time. It is only about one hundred million million years old! The universe is inconceivably vast in space. It takes light 466 years to travel from the star Rigel to us, which means that if the star had been destroyed before the Reformation (through a collision with another star, for example), we should not have discovered the fact yet. And yet the universe is not infinite, neither is it in infinite space.

At first sight this seems like a paradox. How can space be finite? We cannot conceive the *end* of space. Mathematical physics, however, has put forward the conception of a space that is finite, but not bounded, because it is curved. The meaning of a curvature of three-dimensional space can be stated in mathematical formulæ, but it cannot be described in sensible images, it cannot be imagined. We look at a sheet of writing paper; we see a plane surface, possessing two dimensions. We look at the surface of a sphere, a tennis ball, for example; and we understand what is meant by the curvature of two-dimensional space. And, by analogy, we can *conceive*, though we

cannot *picture*, the meaning of the curvature of three dimensional space. Euclid's geometry, for example, does not apply to the surface of a sphere. In that surface, if we define a straight line as the shortest distance (on the surface) between two points, then two straight lines can enclose a space, and, if we take the "poles" of the sphere as our two points, any number of straight lines can be drawn between them. On the sphere, a straight line cannot go on for ever. Its surface is obviously finite, but it is unbounded.

The geometry of the physical space in which we live (although we must not forget that it is very difficult to give an exact meaning to such a phrase as "physical space") may not be Euclid's geometry. Einstein holds that our space is curved. It is unbounded, but it is finite. Light, moving along a "shortest possible line" would, after an inconceivably long time, return to its starting-point. This cannot be tested directly, but there are facts of observation which support Einstein's view.

The presence of matter, according to this view, produces a distortion in the curvature of space. This provides an explanation of gravity. But, if this be the case, we shall expect that not only material particles, but also the electro-magnetic vibrations which make up a "ray" of light, will be deflected from their straight path when they pass near a large mass like the sun. This had never been suspected, still less observed, until Einstein prophesied that it must occur. The exact deflection of light required by his theory was observed, however, in the solar eclipse of 1919, a striking confirmation of the very abstruse mathematical speculations which he had published.

This "curved" space, however, according to the modern physico-philosophical description of nature, is really an abstraction from a four-dimensional continuum. Long before Einstein's theory was published, Mr. H. G. Wells had pointed out, in the *Time Machine*, that a thing that does not last for any time at all cannot be said to have a real existence. "Any real body must have extension in four directions: it must have Length, Breadth, Thickness, and—Duration. . . . There are really four dimensions, three which we call the three planes of Space, and a fourth, Time. . . . There is no difference between Time and any of the three dimensions of space, *except that our consciousness moves along it.*" *Before* and *after* are no more fundamental than *before* and *behind*, *above* and *below*, *right* and *left*. Minkowski, one of the most brilliant of modern mathematicians, has declared, "Henceforth space by itself, and time by itself, are doomed to fade away into mere shadows, and only a kind of union of the two will possess an independent reality."

It is obvious, when once our attention has been drawn to it, that we use space to measure time (the distance on the face of a clock, for example); we even speak of "a space of time." It is equally true that we need time to measure space, time to go from one point to another, or at least time to look from one point to another. The physical universe, then, is a four-dimensional continuum.

Two results of this doctrine are important for our purposes. First, it seems certain that how this continuum is divided up between time and the three dimensions of space depends upon the observer; it is "relative" to his purposes and his movements. Space is relative. If the whole universe were compressed to the size of an orange, and everything in it, including our body and its organs and our standards of measurements, became correspondingly smaller, we should not know that any change had taken place. It is only a rather vulgar lack of imagination that has bludgeoned the mind of the modern man into talking of this *vast* universe; it would be quite as true, and for some purposes much more convenient, to speak of this comfortable little universe. Einstein has proved that if a rod has a definite length for an observer with respect to whom it is at rest, then it will appear shortened to an observer who is in motion, relative to the first observer, in the direction of the rod's length.

"Space is thought's, and the wonders thereof, and the secret of space;
Is thought not more than the thunders and lightnings? Shall thought give place?"*

Similarly, time is relative. Its measurement obviously depends on our standards of measurement. If *everything* suddenly began to go a thousand times more slowly than at present—the movements of the constellations, the rotation of the earth, the swing of the pendulum, the beat of our hearts—nobody would know that there had been any change. Einstein has proved that to an observer in motion with reference to a series of events they appear to happen more slowly. And although most people think they know quite well what they mean when they say that two events happen at the same time, it has been shown that the notion is obscure and riddled with contradictions, and that two events which are simultaneous for an observer at rest with reference to them are not simultaneous for one in motion. And if space is relative, and time, it is a simple matter to show that motion and direction are relative, and we are in a position to believe that Einstein's theory may be true. The popular statement of that theory is that all motion is relative; "it is of necessity impossible to determine

* Swinburne.

absolute motion by any experiment whatever." In more exact and technical language, Einstein's General Theory of Relativity is that " there are an infinite number of systems of reference moving with respect to each other, in which all physical laws assume their simplest form."

Another result from the doctrine that space and time are abstractions from a four-dimensional continuum is that four measurements are necessary to define the relation between any two events. Each of these measurements may not be the same for all observers, if all have not the same fixed relations to the events, but a certain combination of these four measurements is constant for all observers, whatever their spaces and times may be. In other words, it is convenient to speak of events as the primary realities, and of space and time as qualities of events. A simple psychological analysis will show that our perception of matter is really an inference or construction built up from our perception of events. Space, time, and matter, then, are each, in themselves, *abstractions*, the results of the mind's analysis of experience. They are qualities of events. Events in a four dimensional space-time continuum are, for physical science, the reality of what we call the external world.

II

It used to be held generally among scientists, and among the philosophers of science, that this system of thought provides an *explanation* of the physical universe; that its " forces " and " causes " actually exist, and produce the results which appear to follow from them; that the molecules and atoms (and the electrons which make up the atoms) are the substances of which the world is built up, and that if our eyes and microscopes could be conceived powerful enough, we should be able to perceive them. The last quarter of a century, however, has seen a revolution in the logic of science. Every up-to-date thinker on these matters now holds that it is the function of science not to *explain*, but to *describe*. Forces, causes, atoms, electrons, are not existents, discovered in nature, but figments, constructed by the mind in order to provide a working model which, if it existed, would produce the results actually observed in nature. When we say that a body of a certain mass moves with a certain acceleration, we are describing facts of observation. When we say that it is acted on by a certain force, we are not describing an additional fact, or offering an *explanation* of the behaviour of the body, we are describing the same facts in other words. To say that one thing is the cause of another

thing, or one event the cause of another event, or one situation the cause of another situation, is to use a word whose meaning is obstinately obscure unless it means no more than that if it were possible, which it never is, to repeat exactly the former thing or event or situation, the following thing or event or situation would also be repeated. Natural laws are not explanations of why things happen, but descriptions of how they usually happen. Newton's law of gravitation, for example, does not explain *why* an apple falls to the ground; nobody knows why it falls to the ground; to say that the earth attracts it is only covering our ignorance with words. What Newton did was to provide a formula which will describe the acceleration with which the apple moves towards the earth when its connection with the tree is severed. There is, then, no logical contradiction between the idea of Natural Law and the idea of Miracle. If we assume the theistic position that God is creatively active in nature, then natural laws describe the methods by which He usually acts, and miracles are the occasions when, for sufficient reasons, He acts in an unusual way.

Physical science implies, of necessity, a twofold abstraction. There is first the abstraction of classification. Because it seeks resemblances in things and happenings, arranging them under laws and general theories, science must always miss and ignore the unique thing or person or event. And because everything is more or less unique, because everything is individual, and neither nature nor history repeats itself, the concrete actuality of existence always slips through the net of science. We experience the individual and unique thing; every moment has its own peculiar difference; but all that science can define and describe is that in which the experience is not unique, that in which the moment is not different. Its tools are universals. The further science goes, then, towards its goal of one absolutely comprehensive generalization under which all that happens can be subsumed, the more inadequate, because the more abstract, does its account of reality become. It misses all the *meaning* of the universe, for it is in the *here*, the *now*, and the *this*—in what is itself gloriously different from everything else —that we contemplate meaning and create it. And, especially, is science impotent to deal with the most truly individual existences, the living organism, the human being, the self-determining personality. In that sphere the scientific method has little place.

The second fallacy which vitiates the scientific method, if its results are accepted as more than abstractions, is its elimination of the individual observer. The " time " with which, and within which, science works is a " general time," abstracted

from the private times of particular observers. That is the chief reason that science can treat the distinction between *before* and *after* as insignificant, for the individual has an immediate feeling of a difference in quality between past and future. Similarly, scientific space is "generalized" from the private spaces of individuals, each of whom feels the obstinate, inexplicable, distinction between *right* and *left*, a qualitative difference which has disappeared in the abstract space of science. But all experiences are, after all, the experiences of individuals, and when science, abstracting from such data, offers descriptions of what took millions of years to accomplish, or of what necessarily eludes the confirmation of any one individual, its speculations become very doubtful. Anyhow, the doctrine of relativity has riddled this whole way of thinking. For it means, if it means anything at all, that the individual observer, his movements and his purposes, can so little be eliminated from science that only when they are considered can his recorded observations be substantiated or denied.

The last consideration, without which the validity of the scientific point of view cannot be adequately estimated, is that the whole system of physical knowledge is, as yet, an unrealized, perhaps an unrealizable, ideal, resting on an unproved, probably an unprovable, hypothesis—a hypothesis, moreover, to which it is difficult to give any exact meaning. This hypothesis is called sometimes "the uniformity of nature," sometimes the "conservation of energy," and sometimes "causality." The late L. Poincaré, a philosophical mathematician of unique genius, said that the hypothesis could be taken to mean nothing more than "there is something constant," and that in this form it lies outside the bounds of experiment, and is reduced to a kind of tautology. Professor E. W. Hobson affirmed that when the utmost has been attained as regards clearness of statement of this and similar hypotheses, they are doubtful and uncertain, and tentative in their range of applicability, both in theory and in practice. The ideal of science is to describe the whole of physical nature in one comprehensive formula, to fit each event, past, present, and future, into its place in one deductive system. So we shall have ideal models of the atoms of the chemical elements which will enable us to foretell the interaction of these elements and their compounds one with another, which will show why the grass must be green, and the Union Jack red, white, and blue. That ideal is still unrealized. If it should be realized, the universe would be proved to be a deterministic system. Determinism rests upon the assumption of the complete rationality of the universe. But we are very far from succeeding in making even chemistry a completely deductive

science; biology will be harder to include in such a system, and history and ethics more difficult still. There is still the possibility that determinism is not true—the grand perhaps that leaves room for the freedom of God and man.

ALBERT EDWARD BAKER.

(To be concluded.)

CONFESSION TO LAYMEN.—I.

IN this and the following article I shall attempt to tread an interesting bypath of Church history, very little known except to specialists, and describe confession to laymen, not in the exceptional sense (as for example on the battlefield) in which it is familiar in the West, but as a regular institution of the Eastern Church in the early Middle Ages. I begin by sketching very briefly the history of confession up to 1215 as given in O. D. Watkins' monumental work, *A History of Penance*,* first asking the reader to pardon the inevitable faults of such a summary. Some of the statements will have to be reconsidered later when the outlines of the sketch come to be filled in.

I

The Church of to-day agrees with that of primitive antiquity in attaching great importance to the power of binding and loosing. But whereas modern practice is almost entirely a matter of loosing, the ancient Church laid stress on binding. The purity of the Bride of Christ was the first consideration. There were three capital sins, or sins unto death: idolatry, tantamount to apostasy, impurity, and murder. In the second century it was commonly held, so we learn from Hermas, that for such grave offences there was no forgiveness except in baptism. The Church had no mandate to pardon them, they were left to the mercy of God. Hermas assumes that the severer view was justified, but concessions were made and henceforward "penitents" and public confession existed at Rome. It was agreed that penance for post-baptismal sin was possible once only in a life-time. Sins now called venial hardly came under the scope of penance. The bishop was the normal minister of reconciliation.

The evidence of Origen is important but controverted.

* A very useful and cheap treatment of the early period up to 400 is provided by Haslehurst's *Penitential Discipline in the Early Church* (S.P.C.K., 1921).

Confession is ordered to be made to a spiritual man, a priest of the Church, a learned physician. Some of the instructions presuppose a system of confession independent of public penance. The physician of the soul is not expressly termed a priest, "but the sort of experience which he is required to have could seldom fall to a layman."* The unworthiness of the minister affects this rite. "But if he is bound by the chains of his sins it is in vain that he either binds or looses."† The Church has not followed Origen in this.‡

The Decian persecution forms a landmark. The Church now asserted the prerogative of absolution for those who had failed. Confession at this time was to the bishop only, though the deacon could act as his representative. Naturally it was a rare occurrence if the bishop was its normal minister. From 252 onwards, the date of the Novatianist schism, the Church exercised powers with respect to sins which had formerly been left to the mercy of God.

The period 350-430 was one in which discipline was ineffective "except for (*a*) those who voluntarily sought it and (*b*) a few exceptional and notorious cases indicated for punishment by authority."§ The difference between Antioch and Asia Minor is startling. Basil's canonical epistles show a system of graded and severe penances enforced only with difficulty. There seems to have been no formal expression of reconciliation other than restoration to communion. Chrysostom attacks the rigorous Asian system and proclaims repeated penitence and repeated forgiveness; but the penitent has liberty, and confession is not necessary to forgiveness.

The Church of Constantinople inherited no traditions. The Asiatic system probably never got a footing. About 391 the penitentiary was abolished by Nectarius. The significance of this is disputed. This official seems to have taken the place of public penance, not of private confession. He was abolished because he was only a survival and the practice had fallen into desuetude. In any case the time was marked by a relaxation of morals. "In the fifth century Penance in time of health was nearly lost in the West, as in the East, and it would have to be regained."‖ The recovery was to come in an unexpected way. We note in passing that "no verbal absolution in any form but that of prayer is known to have been preserved."¶ The supplicatory form is still preserved in the East. While no *Ego te absoluo* is known before the thirteenth century, it is possible that such forms had their roots in antiquity.

* Watkins, p. 139. † *Comm. in Matt.* xvi. 18.
‡ But the Eastern Church for centuries *did* follow him.
§ Watkins, p. 319. ‖ *Ibid.*, p. 465. ¶ *Ibid.*, p. 493.

The modern Western system of penance originated in Celtic monasticism. We must distinguish between confession as a devotional habit and confession which preceded or formed part of reconciliation and restoration to communion. There is " no indication that any ceremony, or any form of absolving words, was used by any priest at the point of time when, the penance having been accomplished, the penitent proceeded to make his communion."* As the monks confessed to their head, so sisters confessed to the abbess, quite apart from any Church discipline. The Continental system of public penance never gained a foothold in these islands. The early Church of the English accepted the Celtic system, which spread from Britain and Ireland to the Continent and eventually reached Italy. By a kind of " osmosis "† laymen outside monasteries were led to adopt the monks' practice. Finally it was stereotyped into the modern system by the Lateran Council of 1215.

II

It is a defect in Dr. Watkins' fine book that he leaves the Eastern Church in the fifth century and neglects the fascinating story of confession as taught and practised there in the following centuries. We can best introduce the special subject of these articles by printing extracts from a document of the eleventh century, the Epistle " Concerning Confession " by Simeon the New Theologian formerly ascribed to St. John Damascene. It is printed in Dr. Holl's *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum*‡ (Leipzig, 1898); also in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* 120.

Simeon was born about 965 in Paphlagonia, and went to Constantinople as a boy. He entered the monastery of Studium, where Simeon the Studite became his spiritual father. At the age of twenty-two he was called to be a monk. He was ordained and eventually became Hegoumenos. By this time the Studite was dead. Nicetas the Syncellos, jealous of Simeon, attacked him for making Simeon the Studite a saint. He pleaded before the Patriarch; questions of fact only were argued, for no one doubted the possibility of honouring one lately deceased as a saint. At first Simeon won, but Nicetas persevered and after six years Simeon was ordered to destroy the ikons of his spiritual father. He refused and was banished from the capital. Influential attempts were made to bring him back, but he preferred to stay where he was, and founded a new monastery.

* Watkins, p. 612. † The phrase is Dr. Hörmann's.

‡ The materials for these articles have been drawn from Holl, and to a less extent from Hörmann, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laienbeicht* (Donauwörth, 1913).

The significance of all this is that Simeon was under suspicion for heresy during a large part of his life, but no voice was raised against him for his teaching on confession, which must therefore represent the mind of the contemporary Church of Constantinople. This was, in brief, that a fallen sinner is helpless to get up again, without the help of a mediator. This mediator must be a "friend of God," one who possesses the high dignity of binding and loosing. Bishops, who first had the dignity, have forfeited it; so have priests. It has come to the monks, many of whom also are unworthy. The right of binding and loosing is therefore a personal prerogative of those who are true disciples of Christ and possess the Spirit, as shown by their charismatic gifts.

Simeon keeps the theoretical possibility of priests exercising the power, but assumes that they do not. As against his opponents he maintains that only the spiritual among the monks, whether cleric or lay, possess the power. They would have answered that it was confined to priest-monks.

THE TREATISE OF SIMEON THE NEW THEOLOGIAN ON CONFESSION.

1. Thou hast commanded our poverty, father and brother, putting a question, to tell thee: "Whether it is permissible for men to confess their sins to monks who have not the priesthood," adding this: "for we hear that to the priests alone has been given the authority to bind and loose." Now these are the words and the helpful questions of thy devout soul and of thy fervent desire and prayer. And we have ascertained thy good purpose, how that thou seekest to learn about divine and holy things, but we are unable to discern or write about such things and therefore should have preferred to keep silence. For to compare spiritual things with spiritual is the part of impassive and holy men, from whom we are far removed in life and utterance and virtues.

2. [S. calls upon God for help in his task.]

3. [We are all God's debtors, but baptism bestows wealth.]

4. [We and the treasure within us are kept by the Commandments, which like so many guards keep us and not we them.]

5. [He that has fallen among robbers, spiritually speaking, and has been wounded, needs a physician and a mediator.] He that has done such things and so angered his master and God cannot otherwise be reconciled to God except through a mediator, a holy man, a friend and servant of Christ, and through the shunning of evil.

6. [The moment we are wounded, let us fly to the spiritual physician, and take his remedies and antidotes for poison.]

7. Seek, if you please, a mediator and physician and good counsellor, that as a good counsellor he may suggest ways of repentance in a manner appropriate to good counsel, as a physician may give thee a drug suitable to each wound, and as a mediator by prayer and intercession with God, standing before Him face to face, may propitiate the Divine Being on thy behalf. Do not therefore strive to find a flatterer or belly-slave and

make him thy counsellor and ally, lest concurring in thy will he teach thee not what God loves but what thou dost welcome, and thou remain still verily an unreconciled enemy. Nor shouldest thou seek an inexperienced physician, lest by his great severity and untimely cuttings and burnings he land thee in a pit of despair, or again by his excessive sympathy he leave thee diseased and—most terrible fate—hand thee over, still thinking thyself well, to eternal punishment in a way thou expectest not. For this fate the earthly disease of the soul dying with us procures for us. But a mediator between God and men is not I think secured so simply. "For they are not all Israelites which are of Israel," but they who understand clearly according to the name and actual power of the name and, being intelligent, see God. Nor are all those who are called by the name of Christ really Christians. "For not everyone that saith to Me, Lord, Lord" saith Christ "shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of My Father." So also elsewhere: "Many shall say to Me in that day, Lord, have we not cast out devils in Thy name? and I shall say to them, Verily I say to you, I know you not, depart from Me, ye workers of iniquity."

8. [The care necessary in both mediators and sinners.]

9, 10. [Further exhortations.] But let us now say what thou, child, hast sought to learn.

11. For that it is permissible for us to confess to a monk who does not possess the priesthood, this thou wilt find has taken place since the time that the garment and cloak of repentance was given by God to His inheritance and men called monks appeared. This is written in the inspired writings of the fathers, in which if thou lookest thou wilt find how true my words are. But before them high priests [*i.e.*, bishops] alone used to receive authority to bind and loose in succession from the divine apostles, but as time went on and the high priests became useless, the awesome commission passed to priests of blameless life and counted worthy of divine grace. Then these also fell away, priests and high priests together becoming like the rest of the people and many, as we see to-day, encountering deceitful spirits and foolish vanities and being lost, and the commission, as we have said, was transferred to the elect people of God, I mean the monks. Not that the priests or high priests were deprived of it; rather they parted with it themselves. "For every priest is constituted as a mediator with God between God and men" as Paul says "and ought to offer sacrifice as for the people so also for himself."

12. But let us begin our discourse higher up and see whence and how and to whom this authority of sacrificing and binding and losing was given originally, and the answer shall be set out in order and clearly to match thy question, not only for thy benefit but also for all others.

When our Lord and God and Saviour said to the man with the withered hand: "Thy sins are forgiven thee," the Hebrews hearing said: "This man speaketh blasphemy. Who can forgive sins except God alone?" Never yet had forgiveness of sins been given thus, not by prophets or priests or by anyone of the patriarchs. Wherefore the scribes were annoyed as though some new dogma or surprising thing were being proclaimed. But the Lord did not blame them for this but rather He taught them what they did not know, showing that He was God and was not as man bestowing the forgiveness of sins committed. For He says to them: "That ye may know that the Son of Man hath authority to forgive sins, He says to the man with the withered hand, Stretch out thy hand, and he

stretched it out and it was restored whole as the other "; thus confirming the greater and invisible wonder by that which was visible. Similarly with Zacchæus, the harlot, Matthew from the receipt of custom, Peter after his three-fold denial, and the paralytic whom He healed and finding subsequently said to him: "Behold thou art become whole, sin no more lest a worse thing befall thee." Saying this He showed that the man fell into the disease through sin and when he was freed from it he received also the forgiveness of his sins. For Christ demanded no long times (of waiting), no fasting, no lying on the ground, but only conversion and unhesitating faith and cutting away of evil and true repentance and many tears—witness the harlot and Peter weeping bitterly.

Here is the beginning of this great gift befitting God only, which He alone possessed. Then, about to return to heaven, He leaves such a gift to His disciples in His stead. But how did He bestow upon them this honour and authority? Let us learn who they were and how many and when it happened. They were the eleven chosen disciples, the doors were shut, and they were gathered together within. For coming and standing in their midst He breathed on them and said: "Receive the Holy Spirit; whose soever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto them; whose soever ye retain, they are retained." He gives them no command at the time concerning penalties, since they were about to be taught by the Holy Spirit.

13. So, as we have said, the holy apostles transmitted this authority by way of succession to those who occupied their thrones, since of the rest no one dared even to think of such a thing. So carefully did the disciples of the Lord guard the just assignment of this authority. But in process of time, as we said above, the worthy were confused and mingled with the unworthy and were hidden by the crowd, each being ambitious to surpass the other and falsely claiming the preeminence in virtue. For after those who occupied the thrones of the apostles were proved to be fleshly and pleasure-loving and vain-glorious and they turned aside to heresies, the divine grace deserted them and this authority was taken from such men. Wherefore, dispensing with all other things which sacrificing priests ought to have, they require the possession of this alone—orthodoxy. And I am not sure even of this, for not he who refrains from introducing new dogmas into the Church of God is orthodox, but he who has a life in harmony with right doctrine. But such a life the patriarchs and metropolitans of to-day either have sought and failed to find, or else having found it they have preferred the unworthy life, asking only this, the setting forth in writing of the symbol of the faith, and accepting only this, that a man be not a zealot for good or contend with any on account of evil. Thus they win peace as it were on earth for the church, but it is worse than any enmity and the cause of great instability. On this account the priests have become useless and like the people. For none of them was salt, to quote the Lord's word, that they might bind up with rebukes and restore by all possible means the diseased life, but rather they condoned and covered up one another's vices and became worse than the people, and the people in their turn worse than they. But some of the people proved themselves better than the priests, shining like glowing coals in the dark gloom of the priests. For if these latter had been shining in their life like the sun, the glow of the coals would have been imperceptible, they would have been put out by the clearer light. But when the cloak and the garment of the priesthood alone was left among

men, and the gift of the Spirit passed to the monks and was displayed by signs showing that they had attained the life of the apostles by their deeds, then again the devil wrought his own work. For seeing them displayed again to the world as new disciples of Christ and shining forth in their life and their marvels, he introduced his false apostles and private devices and mingled them with the monks. So little by little the monks multiplied, as thou seest, and became useless and quite unworthy of their name.

So then the power to forgive sins has been given by God neither to monks wearing the habit, nor to those who have been ordained and picked out for the rank of priesthood, nor to those who have been honoured by the dignity of the high priesthood, I mean patriarchs and metropolitans and bishops, (14) simply because of ordination alone and the honour attaching to it—away with the idea, for to offer sacrifice only has been granted them, and I think many of them have not even this, lest being grass they should be burnt up thereby. No, it has been granted only to those to whom among priests and high priests and monks it belongs to be numbered among the bands of Christ's disciples because of their holiness.

15. [How shall such men recognize the gift in themselves and others recognize it in them? Scriptural tests. Mk. xvi. 17*f;* Jn. x. 27; Mt. vii. 16, 20; Gal. v. 22; 1 Cor. xii. 8-11; Mt. v. 14, 15.] And why do I lengthen my discourse saying these many obvious things? If each of the aforesaid finds that he has attained every virtue which one hears read out from the holy Scriptures, and in like manner has performed every good act, and in regard to each has recognized its progression, variation and rank, and is uplifted to the height of the divine glory—then let him know that he has become partaker of God and His gifts, and he shall be known by those that see well and even by the dim-sighted. And so such may say to all with boldness: "We are ambassadors on behalf of Christ as though God was beseeching you through us, Be ye reconciled to God." For all such have kept the commandments of God unto death, sold their goods and distributed to the poor, followed Christ by enduring temptations, lost their own souls for the love of God in this world and found them unto life eternal. But finding their own souls they found them in light intellectual, and so in this light they saw the light unapproachable, God Himself, according to the Scripture "In Thy light shall we see light." How then is it possible for a man to find his soul? Attend: The soul of each is the coin which was lost, not by God, but by each one of us plunging himself into the darkness of sin. But Christ having come as the true light, and meeting those that seek Him, as He himself alone knows how, granted them to see Himself. For this finding one's soul is seeing God, and in His light becoming higher than every visible creature, and having God as shepherd and teacher, from Whom one will know how to bind and loose, and having known accurately one will adore the Giver and impart to them that desire.

16. To such, my son, I know has been given the authority to bind and loose from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit, those who are His sons by adoption and His holy servants. Of such a man was I myself a disciple, a father with no ordination from men; but by the hand or rather the Spirit of God He chose me out for discipleship and bade me receive ordination from men because of the honourable stamp which follows it, when I had for a long while been stirred by the Holy Spirit to this end with vehement longing.

17. Wherefore, brethren and fathers, let us first pray that we may become like these men, and then let us discourse to others concerning freedom from passions and the reception of rational arguments, and let us seek such a spiritual father. Let us by preference seek laboriously such men as are true disciples of Christ and with toil of heart and many tears for a stated period of days supplicate God that He may open the eyes of our hearts to know where such a one in this evil generation may be found. Then having found him we shall receive forgiveness of our sins through him, obeying his precepts and commands with all our soul, just as he, having heard Christ's commands, has become partaker of His grace and His gifts, and received from Him authority to bind and loose sins, inflamed by the Holy Spirit, to Whom belongs all glory, honour, and worship with the Father and the only begotten Son for ever. Amen.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

(To be concluded.)

SPIRITUAL HEALING: TOWARDS AN INTERPRETATION

It was inevitable that the widespread revival of spiritual healing should be attended by much controversy and by great differences of opinion, not only about details, but even as to fundamental principles.

There is no need to describe the many and various forms that the movement has taken; ranging as they do from the dry affirmations of "Christian Science" to the full Catholic doctrine of Holy Unction; and from missions of healing and clinics for auto-suggestion to the psycho-analyst's consulting-room. Amid such a welter of divergent views and methods it is not easy to discover the central and really Christian position. Perhaps even yet the time has hardly come for formulation or for restatement in the light of recent experience. It may be that we are still too near to it all for the meaning to be quite clear.

But, on the other hand, those who are called upon to proclaim the Christian message and to give a reason for the faith that is in them are sure to be asked concerning this thing, and they feel the need for some intelligible explanation, or, at least, for a working theory with which to satisfy inquirers. What is wanted is to have an idea of the aim and meaning of spiritual healing comprehensive enough to include all that is right and good in the varying and even contradictory statements that are heard upon the subject even from the Christian standpoint alone.

For Church people look at the idea of healing in so many different lights and with such varying beliefs as to its possibilities and aims, that they are very apt to emphasize some one aspect quite unduly, and to the exclusion of others of equal importance, and so to lose that sense of proportion which is so necessary to a right understanding of its place in the Christian life. Yet may we not rightly hope that the great mass of evidence now at our disposal will be found capable of reduction to some consistent theory based upon clear and final principles. The following thoughts are offered towards some such interpretation.

First of all we need to discover what is the central aim in any method of healing that claims to be spiritual; and what it is that actually is found to take place. This must be settled before we can be in a position to know in what spirit to approach the matter; and also along what lines of procedure we shall be wise to move.

The only possible starting-point seems to be frankly to claim that such healing should be regarded as essentially sacramental. "As St. Paul saw, the indwelling of God secures the redemption not only of the soul, but of the body also, . . . and, on the other hand, since man is embedded in two worlds, the spiritual and the physical, God uses material things as means by which He approaches and reaches the heart of the individual. The ultimate reason for all our care about health is our knowledge that material factors have a powerful influence on the spiritual life and character of men. . . . Grace is given to us by certain physical means."* Thus, to use sacramental means of healing is to be in line with God's normal means of dealing with us, and comparison with the ways in which other more familiar "means of grace" are employed will help our investigation throughout.

(To those who may object here that the prayer of faith alone is enough to obtain the gifts of God and, among them, that of health, it is replied that certainly it may be, and often is, but that all the same the sacramental "pledge to assure us thereof" is a condescension to our nature for which most people are grateful; quite apart from the fact that living as we do in a sacramental universe, and as members of a "Spirit-Bearing Body," the Church, that is the kind of way in which it is natural for men to seek and find God.)

Now, the essence of any of the sacraments is surely nothing less than this, God's gift to us of His own life. It is God Himself coming to, and acting upon, the recipient, and that for

* This and other passages quoted in this article are taken from Provost Taylor's pamphlet *The Sacramental Principle.*

some specific purpose, which, for our argument, we may term the aim or the meaning of that particular sacrament. On the human side, therefore, the conditions obviously indispensable are humility, penitence, and faith; the latter being taken to include the deliberate intention to co-operate with the Divine purpose expressed in that sacrament. With all this goes the appointed use of some "effective symbol" as the channel of the Divine grace. And, lastly, "that the group-mind is felt to play a dominant part in the process is evident from the insistence that sacraments shall be administered by persons who represent the whole group. Sacraments are not spells worked by private individuals, they involve the disposition of the whole mind of the Church to the action and passage of God."

Here it may be noted in passing that healing is equally sacramental, whether it is administered by the administration of Holy Unction or by the laying on of hands. Nor need the possession of special "gifts of healing" invalidate our argument, provided that they are exercised with the blessing of the Church and in the name of Christ; in both methods the corporate faith of the whole Body is behind the actual instrument.

Accordingly, those who lay such great stress upon the need for as much preparation for sacramental healing as for any other sacrament, in order to safeguard as far as possible against unworthy reception, are perfectly right, and their caution is vindicated by the fact that failures and, worse still, relapses do occur. Only there is one more factor that must always be taken into consideration, and which comes before any preparation, and that is the Divine initiative—the call of God to the soul. This may be something quite vague, consisting, perhaps, in the mere fact that such means of grace are known to exist and to be used by the Church in general. Or it may be something very personal and particular, such as a felt call to ask for some such means. Though this, again, may be nothing more than the mere knowledge that, for example, a healing mission is going to be held, coupled with a desire to go and see what that may bring forth. The point is that we must be ready to admit the possibility of people seeking—yes, and finding—spiritual healing with very little or with no apparent faith to start with, except in so far as they are drawn by the simple desire to be something better than they are, if only in the physical sense. That may be the very utmost that they are capable of in their present condition, and as such God can use, and will not despise it. Experience proves that faith and penitence always follow, even if they do not precede the gift of healing. So, then, after everything possible has been done to

safeguard the sacredness of the gift, and due warning given of the sin and the danger of unworthy reception, we should be very slow indeed to exclude any who honestly desire it. The responsibility will then be theirs. We do not read that our Lord refused anyone who came to Him for healing; those who were unfit did not come.

So much, then, for the human side, and now for the Divine. Here we have the absolute assurance that, given the requisite conditions, the gift will follow. Good measure, running over and above all that we desire or deserve, is the measure with which God responds to our faith. He has pledged His word that the "inward spiritual grace" shall accompany the "outward visible sign." And in the case of physical healing it will be quite evident whether that particular gift has been received. If health is restored, however slowly, the further problem will not arise. But supposing it does not, if there is, instead, what seems to be some failure, either wholly or partially, then we are obliged to look for some explanation, or to take some larger view, such as will still justify our action and vindicate our faith.

In some such cases the reason may be fairly evident—some failure in the preparation, or want of faith, or even an unworthy motive. But clearly this cannot cover all such cases, and it may be in direct conflict with what is perhaps the most remarkable of all facts about sacramental healing, which is the practically unanimous testimony to the purely "spiritual" benefits received; to the changed outlook on life as a whole, and upon the illness in particular, and frequently also to the vivid realization of the Presence of Christ experienced—and that not only by Christians—all of which results are far more precious than the hoped-for restoration to health. This testimony confirms our claim that sacramental healing is in a line with the whole purpose of the sacraments, which is, as we have said, to bring the life of God into the conscious life of the believer. And if it has done that in any kind of way, it surely has not failed.

So, then, we are clearly wrong if we limit the purpose of spiritual healing to the obtaining of physical health. And here we must take account of the idea that sickness is always and necessarily contrary to the will of God. If that were so, and if God had ordained sacramental healing as its remedy, would it not be natural to suppose that it could hardly be permitted to fail of its object? Is not the truth rather that, although sickness has in itself something essentially evil and contrary to the will of God, and though it means a falling short of God's purpose for human life, yet it is emphatically the lesser of two evils, the greater of which is sin. And, further, in a world like

ours, in which we become convinced of the redemptive power of suffering, including that due to disease, a world which we can only begin to understand if we look upon it as a place where the spirit of man is to be trained and developed by the endurance of bodily conditions, with their hardships and limitations, can we not readily agree that there are cases in which the continuance of bodily suffering is necessary to the attainment of spiritual perfection? This seems to be the nearest we can get to an explanation, and it is confirmed by St. Paul's account of his dealings with the "thorn in the flesh." This he clearly recognized as an evil thing, "a messenger of Satan," not from God; and he has no hesitation in asking quite definitely and with only the one essential qualification for its removal. But having done so, and finding no physical relief, he took that to be a definite answer from God that, in his case, its continuance was a spiritual necessity. But he did get in addition what was the real answer to his prayer, and what is also the experience of many to-day, "grace sufficient" to enable him to overcome and triumph over it—in the spirit, if not actually in the flesh. The strength of God was thus to be made perfect in his weakness. And thus he found what R. L. Stevenson expressed rather differently when he said that true health consists in learning to do without it—if need be. So there may be two answers to the prayer for healing; either the removal of the "thorn," or else its transformation into something not merely bearable, but possibly even welcome; and one or the other we have every right to expect.

But, in any case, the whole matter has now been deliberately referred to the judgment of God, and placed in His hands. We have done what we could, and there we may confidently leave it. We need no longer reproach ourselves, both for our own sakes and still more when it is the suffering of others that is in question, lest we have left undone what might have had good success had we been more faithful. That is one great comfort of sacramental healing; it delivers us from the only too well-founded dread that the disease is the sign of something spiritually wrong, which we ought to have put right, the continuance of which remains our own grievous fault.

The sanest working theory of sickness is that which sees it as the equivalent in the physical realm of sin in the spiritual. But then we must remember that since spiritual things are of far greater importance than physical, there is a danger in thinking of them as parallel. So they are, but in different categories and of unequal value. So that if we have to choose between the two, it is clear that spiritual good is always to be preferred to mere physical health. Though, as a matter of fact,

both react upon each other to such an extent that it is seldom we are really driven to weigh the one against the other.

Thus, subject only to the possible conflict of spiritual with physical health, we can say that we are just as much bound to fight against sickness as against sin; and that it appears that God has empowered His Church for the double warfare. The words of St. James read almost like a command, "If any is sick, let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." It is his duty to send for them, and theirs to respond—and a grave responsibility on both sides to neglect to do so. And surely, too, it is not mere coincidence that the words recall another exhortation, similar in its appeal. "If any of you cannot quiet his own conscience, let him come and open his grief." Does not this resemblance give us a clue to the meaning of both the ministries referred to? There is surely something parallel in the purpose of penance and of healing; the one deals primarily with the spiritual, the other with the physical effects of sin. For it will hardly be denied that sickness is in some cases quite directly, and probably in all indirectly, the result of human sin, and that is perhaps the nearest we can get to an account of its origin, though no doubt the sin is often not so much that of the individual as of the whole Body to which he belongs. While, on the other hand, the faith by which he is healed may be far less his own than that of the Church empowered to heal, and of her more faithful members. We are members one of another in sickness and in health; for better for worse.

And in this connection it should be remembered that forgiveness does not necessarily include the letting off of punishment, the escaping of, for example, the physical consequences of wrong-doing. That is not the point of forgiveness, which is the reconciliation of the sinner with His God. And those who are truly penitent are not resentful of penance, nor will they doubt the reality of their forgiveness because they still suffer the inevitable consequences which they have brought upon themselves. So if our conclusions are right, that spiritual healing means *absolution on the physical side*, we shall know that if sickness goes on, it has become a penance, and in this way may be made a means of grace. We can no longer look upon it as meaningless, or as a token of alienation from God.

And here, indeed, we touch upon holy ground; for we cannot ignore that other aspect of sickness which St. Paul also knew, whatever may be the exact meaning of his reference to "filling up that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh." This mysterious idea is perhaps best approached in the light

of his great conception of the life "*in Christ*," which coloured His whole teaching, and of His other great thought of the Church as His Body, "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all," or, as another translation has it, "Who all in all is being fulfilled." It is in His Mystical Body the Church that Christ suffers still, and her sufferings are thus not without saving power. Indeed, vicarious suffering is an obvious fact of human life, much more then of life "in Christ." But this high and holy calling to suffer with Christ is not a claim to be lightly made, if we will but consider how much suffering is due to sin. "Let no man say he is tempted of God, for . . . God tempteth no man, but each man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust and enticed . . . and the sin bringeth forth death." There is nothing there of sharing in the afflictions of Christ, but rather adding to them. But we find it among the saints, and therefore we must meet the objection that some lives are undoubtedly transformed by physical sufferings. We have seen in the case of St. Paul himself that this need not preclude prayer for healing. How, then, is the prayer answered in the case of those whose sanctity is won through the endurance of physical pain? Surely the same principle holds good in their case also. "The sting of death is sin," and so it is of sickness also. It is that which we believe God will put away in the sacrament of healing; it means the purging out of the evil element in what they suffer, the removal of all that hinders the will of God for them, so that there is left nothing to check the soul's free communion with Him, which is its true life. Only when we have done everything possible to put away the evil element which is in all disease, that which it has in common with spiritual evil, only then can we accept it as one of the many things that "work together for good to them that love God." And unless it can be so accepted and even welcomed, it cannot become a means of sanctification, nor admit us into "the fellowship of His sufferings."

So it comes to this. The ultimate aim of spiritual healing is the invoking of the power of God upon the whole man, and with particular regard to the ills of his physical nature, in order that whatever there is contrary to God's perfect will, may be done away, and that the life henceforth to be lived in the flesh may be cleansed, renewed, sanctified, and rededicated to His fuller service. It is by such consecration that "the human body, instead of being the enemy of things spiritual, becomes God's willing and fitting instrument."

MARJORY WIGHT.

LIBERAL EVANGELICALISM

We propose, at the commencement of this article, to indicate the lines upon which it will proceed. Emphasis will be laid on the fact that we are Evangelicals, and then an attempt will be made to define our attitude towards the other historic parties or groups in the Anglican Church.

A very interesting book has appeared within the last three years, by Friedrich Heiler, *Der Katholizismus*. Heiler was a Roman Catholic priest, but on account of his Modernist tendencies was forced to leave his Church, and has become a Lutheran. Instead of making a fierce attack on the Church he has left, he has, on the contrary, gone out of his way to say what he can on her behalf, although at the same time he is careful to point out her grave weaknesses and serious shortcomings. The whole book breathes a spirit of Christian charity and real concern for the highest interests of truth and faith. Heiler's favourite word is "Catholic." An all-inclusive Christianity, comprising the best elements in all the Churches, be they Roman, Eastern, or Protestant, with a due regard for the needs of the average man, is the ideal which, he considers, we should all strive to realize. Now we, too, like the word Catholic, but Evangelical still better. Call us narrow if you will, Protestant if you so desire, dangerously broad and heterodox if you prefer, but Evangelical in heart and spirit we wish to be, and hope we are. Catholic Evangelicalism may describe our position. Evangelical, however, we are first and foremost, and Catholic second. This is "the order of our going," we should not desire it to be otherwise.

At once we shall be asked, "What is the precise meaning you attach to the word Evangelical?" Our answer is near at hand: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself."

Christ is the supreme Revelation of God's Holy Love and Eternal Purpose. God revealed to us in terms of the highest and deepest reality a perfectly human life, and because perfectly human, the most perfectly Divine Life that has ever appeared on earth. In Christ, God has stooped down to bless us, not by sending a deputy, however highly placed, but by coming Himself, not by raising a richly endowed man to the status of the Divine, but by the descent of Himself to our human level. The Eternal God clothed Himself in human flesh, He was personally present in the Child of Mary, the Carpenter of Nazareth, and submitted to all the conditions and limitations proper to our manhood.

When we have said this, we do not imply that the whole of the Gospel has been given. Our forefathers laid stress on the fact of sin. Never were they weary of reiterating and enforcing that the primary need of man was not so much an increased knowledge of God as reconciliation with Him. Salvation from sin through the precious blood of Christ was the burden of their message.

And here it seems to us that if we are to be true to the Evangelical tradition, and what is even more important to experience, we of all groups in the Church should never tire of insisting upon the paramount necessity of man's redemption. Lord Morley, who could not by any manner of means be considered favourable to orthodoxy, writes in one of his essays about " that horrid burden and impediment of the soul which the Churches call sin, and which, by whatever name we call it, is a very real catastrophe in the moral nature of man."

The writers of *Lux Mundi* have asserted that the Incarnation should form the basis of dogma, the Evangelicals of a generation or two ago insisted upon the Cross of Calvary, the Atonement as that basis, but we to-day prefer to declare that the fundamental doctrine of the Christian Revelation is the Redemptive Fatherhood of God.

> "The Father's love the Cross ordained,
> His own high law the Son sustained."

This reconciliation is not limited to a select few, but is extended to all mankind. The Kingdom of God, its rule and its extension, founded emphatically upon the preaching of the Atonement, must therefore be the goal of our efforts. The proudest achievement of the Evangelical party in the past has been the Church Missionary Society. That noble society has made history; it is our bounden duty to see that it goes on making history.

Evangelization, whether at home or abroad, must be promoted with the same zeal and devotion by the sons of the Evangelicals as by their fathers in their time.

It may have occurred to some of our readers that such phrases as " justification by faith " and " sanctification " have been avoided. Probably were they to be mentioned to the average congregation of to-day, they would not be very intelligible to many of its members. But the experiences denoted by these words ought to become the current coin of our spiritual fatherland. Prayer, Sacrament, and Bible-reading all have their place in the building up of the Christian life and character, and we dislike to hear any one of the three pitted against the other two. Nevertheless, the Christian life *starts* with conversion,

which implies that a man accepts Jesus Christ as his personal Saviour and Redeemer. It is not required of him at the outset that he should love God, but it should be an ever-growing and ever-deepening conviction on his part that God loves him, notwithstanding the also ever-growing and ever-deepening conviction of his sinfulness, these two convictions acting and reacting upon, and intensifying, each other. The attitude he should adopt is that of throwing himself upon Christ's redeeming love and saying with St. Augustine, "Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis." Sooner or later the love of Christ will awaken a corresponding love, though in a very much lesser degree on the believer's part, and then this justifying faith will assume the character of "faith working by love." Being thus rooted and grounded in the saving knowledge and experience of Christ's redeeming love, the sap of His Divine grace will flow through the converted man's life, and in time will be followed by the fruits of holy living, for, as Martin Luther has said, "It is as impossible to separate works from faith, as it is to separate heat and light from fire."*

Conversion, regeneration, surrender to Christ, wrought by the power of the Holy Spirit working in men's hearts, these are the vital truths of the Christian religion. Be as sacramental as we will, and, in fact, we make bold to say that the Evangelical section of the Anglican Church is more sacramental than either the Roman or the Greek Churches, yet first and foremost we must ourselves feel and impress upon our congregations that spiritual progress is not to be measured by numbers, either of the candidates presented for Confirmation or the acts of Communion which take place within a given twelve months, but by changed hearts and transfigured lives.

It is very far from our intention to depreciate the immense value of the sacraments, but there is pressing need to witness to the Church the overwhelming necessity for spiritual, not mechanical, religion. Formalism is a danger to which all of us are exposed, but it may be, alive to that particular danger as we should be, we may, as part of our special contribution to the whole, be able to help the other groups in the Church to be on their guard against it.

Again, our appeal is to the New Testament, to the Mind and Spirit of Christ. We do not wish to say that other groups in our Church are not making the same appeal, or to assume that to us, as distinct from others, have been presented the lively oracles of God.

It was a favourite saying of Bishop Talbot's that the teaching

* Quoted by Professor Jacobs in article on Martin Luther in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. viii., p. 201.

Church must be a learning Church as well, and we of all people should be most willing to learn. None the less, for the sake of the truth itself, we must insist that the ultimate court of appeal is to our Lord's teaching, as reflected most clearly in the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament. Granted that there is a development of Christian truth throughout the ages, yet it must be a *truly* evolved growth, a naturally following development from that teaching. Any doctrine or practice which contravenes the spirit of this principle must be rejected.

Here we would make a rapid survey of our relationship towards our Anglo-Catholic brethren.

First, however, may we meet an objection which they oppose to our position ? They tell us they have very much in common with us, our positive beliefs they hold, and have therefore as much right to call themselves Evangelicals as we have, that we Evangelicals have got hold of some glorious truths, but they need to be supplemented, if we are fully to realize the rich heritage handed down to us by the Catholic Church.

Our reply is twofold. First, if you can show that in our presentation of Christian truth we are leaving out teaching which has the warrant of the New Testament behind it, no other course lies open before us but to admit at once as a party, or as a group, that we have ignored important elements in our Lord's teaching.

With regard to the two great truths which underlie Christianity, Christ for us, Christ in us, Protestantism is accused of laying such preponderating stress on the first of these as practically to exclude the second. We reply that if some Evangelicals have laid themselves open to this charge, it cannot be brought up against us as a whole, certainly not in the case of those who were influenced by the late Bishop of Durham, Dr. Moule. " Union with Christ " formed an integral part of his teaching, and was consistently exemplified in his saintly life.

Secondly, it is not sufficient to show that a particular doctrine or practice is to be found in the New Testament, but with due sense of proportion what is the special emphasis laid upon it by the Lord Himself, and by those in contact with Him.

We, in our turn, may now indicate one of the principal points at which our path diverges from that of our Anglo-Catholic brethren. We refer to the subject of the Christian ministry, or the organization of the Christian Church. It is stated that the Holy Communion administered by a non-episcopally ordained minister cannot be regarded as valid—that is, " as having the security of the Divine covenant about it." Non-episcopal Christian bodies are unchurched, and are relegated

to the uncovenanted mercies of God. The validity, however, of the Eucharist, as administered by the Roman Catholic Church, is not called in question, although the fact that she withholds the cup from the laity constitutes a grave departure from the Lord's dying command, "Drink ye all of this."

Leaving this on one side, we ask whether the proofs are forthcoming that the Lord laid such stress upon the necessity of a succession of ordination in His Church that for a valid ministry and the due administration of the sacraments such succession and transmission by ordination are necessary? This is not the conclusion arrived at by Dr. Headlam, who would not care to ally himself with our group. He writes, "So far as I am able to judge, it was not held at all in the early Church. I have, I think, read everything from the Fathers which is quoted in favour of Apostolic Succession, and I do not know any passage which speaks of succession by ordination in this sense."*

To the man in the street the difference between the Anglo-Catholic and other Churches consists mainly in the fact that the former adopt more or less elaborate forms of ritual in their services, whilst the latter prefer simpler modes of worship. Hence, by many people, Anglo-Catholics are called Ritualists. The sooner that term is dropped, the better. It irritates them in the same way as it irritates us to be called Low Churchmen.

Whilst we Evangelicals up to the present have regarded with a considerable amount of suspicion any increase of symbolism in our worship, a change is coming over us in this respect, which, if carefully watched and safeguarded, should be productive of good rather than harm. But still more important is the reminder that in our conception of God beauty should have a place. Dante sees in the world of appearances a reflection of Divine Beauty.

> "All things created—both of heaven and earth
> Are but the beam of His idea, who
> By love paternal calls them into birth."
> (*Paradiso*, xii. 52-55.)

Beauty must exist in her own right, and must not be made subservient to either goodness or truth. She has her place in God's Kingdom alongside with them, but is not to be patronized by either of them. Therefore she ought to appear in our worship. Unsightly buildings should not be erected where prayer is wont to be made, they are an outrage to the Divine honour and glory. Now, one of our main positions is the freedom of every man to worship God according to his own

* *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion* (London, John Murray, 1920), p. 128.

capacity and conscience, provided that it is a spiritual worship, and does not express any conception of His Being and Nature which is unworthy of Him. But this is not to say that the absence of ritual and ceremonial is indispensable to spiritual religion, for we are not all constituted alike. To some the absence of elaborate ceremonial and decorative art in the Church is a positive help, but with others the exact reverse is their experience. Worship, then, that is dignified and severe will best assist certain types of mind, whilst colour, warmth, and movement will characterize the worship of those of an opposite temperament. But Evangelicals will question the advisability of always adopting mediæval or even primitive forms of art or ceremonial. We are living in the twentieth century, and the world is a very different one to that of the fourteenth, fifteenth, or even sixteenth centuries.

We cannot help feeling that some fresh thinking will have to take place with regard to our ideas and modes of worship. The "alabaster box of ointment" deserves a greater place in our devotions than it has at present, and more encouragement should be given to the feelings of wonder and awe, even of dread and fascination, in our approach to Him who, though He is our Father, is also "the Wholly Other"—the *Mysterium Tremendum*.

Criticize as we may some of their forms of worship, we ought to be grateful to the Anglo-Catholics for their insistence upon the undoubted truth that when we come to worship first and foremost we come to give, and not merely to receive. Let us hope that one part of our contribution to the Church's life may be the endeavour that there shall be elasticity, ample room given to the simple forms of worship, modern in intention, and in accordance with what is best in the British temperament.

Further, we cannot rest content with beautiful buildings set apart for worship; we must raise our voices in favour of beautifying our towns and cities. The dull, drab surroundings in which so many of our people are compelled to live are detrimental to their highest spiritual interests. We must not leave it to other groups in the Church to voice their protest against this state of things; it is up to us to make our own contribution alongside of theirs. An ugly city is an offence against God as well as against man.

Again, the Anglo-Catholic party lays stress on the corporate side of religion. Herein lies a great source of their strength. Their protest against an excessive individualism, each man having a religion of his own, apart from his fellows, is of the utmost value. The sacraments are social rites; the Lord's Prayer is the model prayer to be used by the members of the

family of God. The good of the whole body as against our own individual preferences and idiosyncrasies needs always to be kept in view.

The Anglo-Catholics have helped us to understand the life and devotion of the multitudes of the Roman and Greek Communions, they have unlocked to us the rich spiritual treasures of the past, but the price they would have us pay is a somewhat heavy one. We are not wanting in charity when we assert that their group frequently displays an entire lack of sympathy with the nobler sides of Protestantism. We should be untrue to our past, and also to the Gospel we believe in, were we to show anything but the utmost tenderness for, and sympathy with, the Reformed Churches.

From the corporate side of religion we must just glance for a moment at its social aspects. To speak of the need for the Christian Churches to be interested in social problems is to preach to the converted. We of the Evangelical group must not be behindhand in this matter; nevertheless, the improvement of social conditions, important as it is, is not the primary work of the Gospel. The regeneration of society depends in the last resort on the regeneration of the individual, and that is the work of the Holy Spirit. Here it may be our duty to call men's minds to this dual necessity. This ye should have done, and not left the other undone.

We have reserved the expression of our attitude towards Broad Churchmen to the last. Their aim and object is not to belittle the Christian revelation, but to bring it into harmony with the best thought of the time. Above all others they are most sensitive to modern thought. They have no very distinct programme, and the vagueness of their beliefs often leaves us somewhat bewildered. They do, however, love the truth, and are prepared to jettison their most cherished beliefs and convictions rather than be false to its claims. Let it be frankly confessed that they have influenced us, as they have the Anglo-Catholics, to a greater degree than some of the latter are prepared to admit. Between the Broad Church group and our own we hope there may be, in days to come, a drawing nearer together which should be of mutual benefit. Anyhow, heresy hunts are abhorrent to us, and any attempt to exclude them from the Church would be unwelcome to us, even though we may profoundly dissent from some of their conclusions.

They have influenced us Evangelicals in the following respects: (1) the Bible, (2) the Atonement, (3) the Future Life.

The old idea of inspiration, in the sense of entire freedom from error or mistake, has been abandoned by nearly all intelligent writers.

Recently the Church Missionary Society has been agitated by the question of the Higher Criticism, mainly in connection with the Old Testament, and this has led to the withdrawal of certain valued supporters of the society. In our opinion the storm centre of criticism lies not in the Old Testament, but in the New. Anyone who has read Eusebius's *Church History* knows how he divides the books of the New Testament into three classes: (*a*) The books concerning which there was no dispute; (*b*) those under dispute; (*c*) the rejected books (Eusebius, iii. 25). Criticism, then, had already played its part in the formation of the New Testament Canon.

Without doubt the Bible should be studied in the spirit of deepest reverence and of loving sympathy. To say "Hands off, it is too sacred for criticism" is not only to be disloyal to the spirit of the Reformation, but also is quite impossible. We are confident that seeing the Holy Scriptures are of God, they cannot be overthrown, and if the critical work already brought to bear upon them is not of God, but of man, it will come to naught, and will be replaced by better and truer criticism.

Liberal Evangelicals will not tie themselves down to any one set of conclusions. We shall have our right and left wings in matters of Biblical scholarship. It may be that in our hands criticism will savour rather less of the lamp, and more of the open air. At any rate, we should desire to prosecute our studies in the same spirit as Fustel de Coulanges, who exclaimed to an excited audience, "Do not imagine you are listening to me; it is History itself that speaks."

Passing from our first division, the Bible, to II., the Atonement, it must be conceded that the divergence between the Evangelicals and Broad Churchmen on the teaching of the Cross is greater than that between Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics.

The view associated with Abelard, and upheld with a wealth of learning by the late Dean of Carlisle, is beautiful so far as it goes, but it does not do entire justice to the New Testament on the subject which must not be explained away, nor does it meet the needs of sinful men and women. Whilst it is true that the form in which the Atonement has often been presented, and also is presented even to-day, appears to be inconsistent with the Fatherhood of God, yet such expressions as "wrath," "propitiation," "the ransom for many," and still more such experiences as "Father, save Me from this hour," the agony in the garden of Gethsemane, the desolation on the Cross, are often ignored or explained away. The Saviour shrank from the accumulated load of the sin of the world which He had to bear in His own body on the Tree; "The sting of death" to Him also "is sin."

We would urge upon this group that the existence of evil as a metaphysical problem has proved itself up to now to be insoluble, but as a practical problem it is far and away the most pressing one which we have to face. Were the Broad Church group to become Evangelistic, we think they might regard with more favour than they do at present what is called the Pauline view of Redemption.

Finally, the views "concerning the Hereafter" entertained by *all* the groups in the Church have undergone within the last two generations considerable modification.

The belief in eternal punishment has disappeared in certain quarters. Here, again, whilst some of us Liberal Evangelicals faintly trust "the Larger Hope," and others believe in conditional immortality, still salvation is not just an academic problem.

No one who tries to read the Gospels as they were first delivered can fail to be impressed by the note of urgency in our Lord's teaching concerning the tremendous issues, so far-reaching in their effects, which men and women are called upon to face here, the horror of those who live without God in the world. Too often these things are sadly lacking from our preaching. Somehow these truths must be recovered.

The tasks which lie before our group are immense. We, of course, are not alone in this respect. On the one hand, we must endeavour to retain the depth and intensity of devotion to our Lord and His Kingdom manifested by the older Evangelicals, coupled with a broader outlook and a wider vision than they possessed. If we are true to our calling and endeavour to rise to the height of our opportunities, we believe that we have a special message to deliver to our countrymen, as well as a particular contribution to make towards the coming of the Kingdom. Herein lies our task and our hope.

Who, indeed, is sufficient for these things?

Our sufficiency is of God.

W. H. Rigg, D.D.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

We alluded last July to the formation of the Literature Committee of the English Church Union and to the extensive programme of study and publication for which the Committee were making arrangements. Since that date the Committee has been enlarged to nearly 100, and may truly be said to represent every department of theological learning. We are glad to note how large a proportion of the members are known to our readers as contributors to this journal. Further, the work of the Committee has now become an integral part of the work of the English Church Union, the following clause having been added to the statement of its "objects":

> To promote study and research, and the dissemination of literature, in all branches of theology and ethics; and in those departments of philosophy, psychology, and natural science which are closely related to religion.

This addition to the "objects" of the Union was unanimously approved by the Council at their meeting on December 17 last.

The untiring energy and intellectual vigour of Dr. Harris, supported as it has been at each stage by the sympathy and help of the President and other officers of the Union, have thus laid the foundations of a work which we trust will be richly blessed. No one who is conversant with the misrepresentations to which the Catholic movement is exposed or with the actual complexities of the intellectual situation of to-day will be under any delusions as to the magnitude of the task before the Literature Committee. Yet the conditions now created for its prosecution are full of hope. The connection with the E.C.U. will ensure that theologians have constantly brought before them the facts and claims of the practical Christian life; while channels will be opened by which the conclusions and the temper of scholarship may irrigate the whole field of the movement. Power only comes to knowledge and wisdom to prayer when the *lex orandi* and the *lex credendi* are attuned. Sometimes in the past one or other has been silent; at others they have seemed to be in discord or to be so far apart as to be scarcely within earshot of any one person at the same moment. The step now taken marks a definite attempt to remedy this in the future; and we believe that it may be of infinite value to the whole Church.

The letter from the Rev. A. H. Baverstock, which we print below, contains a rejoinder to Father Puller's paper on Reservation in one kind which we published last autumn; and he seems to us to make out a strong case, so far as custom in antiquity is concerned. At the same time, the matter is one which it is clearly within the competence of any branch of the Church Catholic to decide for itself, with due regard to precedent, convenience, and the circumstances of the time. The Houses of Clergy and Laity have now both recognized the necessity of Reservation, though great difficulties have been found in giving effect to this in rubrical directions. We venture to suggest that the subject might usefully be referred

to an Archbishops' Committee for consideration and report—a procedure which has been adopted with good results in regard to other matters within the last few years.

The Editor begs to acknowledge the following periodicals received, July to December, 1924:

Half-Yearly. Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.

Quarterly. Journal of Theological Studies; Church Quarterly Review; Laudate; Churchman; International Review of Missions; Hibbert Journal; Journal of Palestine Oriental Society; Biblica (Rome); Gregorianum (Rome).

Bi-Monthly. Catholic Truth and Catholic Book Notes; Journal of Religion (Chicago).

Monthly. American Church Monthly; Blackfriars; Expositor; Expository Times; La Vie et les Arts Liturgiques (Paris); Modern Churchman; Revue Théologique (Louvain).

CORRESPONDENCE

Sir,

Father Puller's treatment of this subject in his two letters is partly exegetical, partly historical.

With his exegesis I am not at the moment concerned. It seems to me to be not only partial in its character, as failing to take into account the whole of our Lord's eucharistic utterances, and wrong in its conclusions, but even fundamentally unsound.

It is, however, with his treatment of the historical evidence that I wish mainly to deal. He would appear to have read Father Freestone's "learned and painstaking" volume—*The Sacrament Reserved.* This careful and impartial survey of the evidence available holds the field, and no writer on the subject can afford to ignore its conclusions. Yet Father Puller does so. He quotes from it, it is true. Yet he ignores its main conclusion that throughout the first six centuries reservation was in one kind alone, in at any rate the great majority of cases; he quotes cases as evidence of communion in both kinds which Freestone has shown cannot be so regarded; and he ignores the bearing of a mass of cases which establish Freestone's main conclusion, except for a footnote in which he alludes to cases of communion in one kind as exceptions to the normal practice.

Father Puller's historical case for the reservation of the chalice is based on eleven cases quoted from various authors. The first of these—that of the distribution of the Blessed Sacrament referred to by Justin Martyr—has no bearing whatever on the matter. Father Freestone has shown this (*The Sacrament Reserved*, pp. 32, 33). The distribution of the Sacrament to the absent from the Liturgy did not involve reservation, and this method of communicating them appears to have been a temporary usage and without influence on the later custom of reservation.

The second case is that of St. Exuperius of Toulouse, who, having sold his sacred vessels for the needs of the poor, "carries (*portat*) the Lord's Body in a wicker basket and the Lord's Blood in a glass vessel." Here there is no mention of reservation or sick communion at all. The words may quite easily refer to the use of these homely vessels as substitutes for

the chalice and patten. Father Puller's conclusion is that "the Saint of Toulouse evidently reserved the Blessed Sacrament under both kinds," and that "no doubt it was the general custom to do so in that age." Such use of evidence shows rather the determined partisan than the impartial historian.

Of the other nine cases on which Father Puller relies, all except one are used to support his thesis simply and solely on the strength of the occurrence in them of such phrases as "the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ." These he holds to imply the presence of both kinds. But, as Father Freestone has shown (p. 63 and note), there is no such implication. The Sacred Host alone or the Precious Blood alone is in fact the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, has always been so regarded in the Church, and is quite naturally so described in several instances.

One instance of this usage may be given here, where it would be possible to give more. A decree of the Council of Nicæa* insists on infants being brought to baptism within forty days after birth, in order that they may receive the Body and Blood of Christ. It is a matter of common knowledge that infants were communicated after baptism from the chalice alone.

In one case, that of St. Cuthbert's viaticum, the phrase used is "the saving sacraments." And again in a footnote Father Puller stresses the phrase "the sacraments of the Lord's Body and Blood." But even such phrases are not conclusive. The word *sacramenta* is often used in this plural form of "the mysteries"; it is just one instance out of several of Latin theological language reflecting the theological language of Greek. The Sacred Host alone might well be described as "the holy mysteries." Similarly, the Blessed Sacrament in one kind in the ceremony of the Fermentum is constantly described as the *Sancta* (Freestone, pp. 78, 79).

We are left with one case and one alone (*and it is the only case to be found in the whole of early Christian literature*) of the reservation of the chalice. This is, of course, in St. Chrysostom's account (historically not very satisfactory) of what happened in Holy Week at Constantinople. Even here it is not clear that we have evidence of any regular custom of *continuous* reservation of the chalice. The overwhelming mass of evidence for reservation being normally in one kind until the custom of intinction for reservation was introduced in the Carolingian period makes Father Freestone's suggestion of a temporary reservation of the chalice for the communion of newly baptized infants on Easter Eve a likely explanation.

Even if it were granted that we have here evidence of a continuous reservation of the chalice, a single instance is not much on which to base a statement that such reservation was normal throughout the primitive period. And it is not enough for Father Puller's purpose to prove this. He has to prove that reservation in one kind was not a usual practice. Father Freestone supplies abundant evidence that it was. Father Puller appears to rule out what Freestone calls "private reservation," and to restrict himself to "public and official reservation." It almost seems as if he wished it to be inferred that the "private" reservation had not the same official sanction as the "public and official" reservation. He writes that "it would needlessly complicate matters" if he were to deal with them. They are absolutely fatal to his case. And any fair statement of the question is bound to take them into account. For it was out of this earlier custom (dating from the beginning of the third century at

* Labbee's Concil., 7, II., p. 368.

latest, and surviving locally as late as the seventh) that the later public reservation grew. The Church first allowed individuals to reserve, in one kind, and communicate themselves at home. Later this liberty was restricted to the clergy, who carried the Blessed Sacrament often on their persons (as St. Benedict did as late as the sixth century) in one kind, and reserved it in an "arca" or "turris," at first possibly in their own houses, later in the churches, for the needs of the faithful.

For another reason it is important to draw attention to this early method of reservation by the faithful from which reservation as now practised has developed. It makes it clear that the original purpose of reservation was not merely, or even mainly, for the communion of the sick, but to supply the faithful with the means of frequent or even daily communion when it was not possible to obtain this at the Liturgy. And it is this use of the reserved Sacrament that Father Puller especially condemns. He maintains that in the early centuries the great majority of Christians had no opportunity of communicating more than once a week, since Mass was only celebrated on Sundays, and that communion was never given them from the reserved Sacrament. Yet Father Freestone (pp. 80 *seqq.*) has cited evidence of frequent or daily communion during this period from St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Cyprian, St. Clement, and St. Hilary. And he traces the origin of Mass of the pre-sanctified, when communion was given with the Blessed Sacrament reserved from the last Mass, to the conjunction of these two circumstances, the habit of frequent communion and the restriction of the celebration of the Mass to certain days.

An interesting account in Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.*, viii., 5) of a miracle at Constantinople "in the time of John" may possibly refer to a Mass of the pre-sanctified. It appears to indicate quite clearly that it was possible to receive at the Liturgy in one kind. Perhaps also, as Freestone remarks, we are justified in concluding that the Manicheans were able to communicate along with Catholics without exciting remark until St. Leo condemned the abstention on this heretical ground from the chalice and expressly commanded that all should receive in both kinds at the public communion. But I am not particularly concerned to defend communion in one kind at Mass. What I am concerned to show is that, in Father Freestone's words, "extra-liturgical communion in public, from the Sacrament reserved in Church (the practice from which this correspondence originated), constitutes a perpetuation of or a reversion to early custom on grounds of practical necessity or convenience" (p. 83, note.) He supplies an instance of this in Humbert's statement (P.L., cxliii., 952) that communion was given in one kind, consecrated at Mass the day before, to pilgrims at Jerusalem. What Father Boyd does is done both East and West to-day; it was done in quite early times.

A. H. Baverstock.

Hinton Martel Rectory,
Wimborne.

Dear Sir,

Those whose acquaintance with St. Jerome's letters is limited to the translation in the Ante-Nicene Library may have some doubt as to the value of Father Puller's quotation in his valuable article on "Reservation," for they may think that in the original the words used are ambiguous and susceptible of a meaning which does not involve the practice.

The translation there runs, "Yet none is richer than he, for his wicker basket contains the body of the Lord, and his plain glass cup the precious blood." It is not easy to conjecture what interpretation was in the mind of the translator. The next sentences are highly metaphorical, and he may have thought that the whole passage applied in some way to S. Exuperius' spiritual life rather than his episcopal rule; the language is quite explicit—"Nihil illo ditius, qui Corpus Domini canistro vimineo portat, Sanguinem in vitro." Happily, we have evidence that the late Dr. Fremantle, the general Editor, was no willing abettor of the mistranslation, for there is another allusion to Reservation in an earlier letter as practised in the Saint's time. It occurs in connection with the fast before Communion (Ep. xlviii., 15), where the writer says, "I know that at Rome it is customary for the faithful always to receive the Body of Christ," and the context shows that he is referring to daily reception at home. Now to this Dr. Fremantle adds a note in which he refers to the passage quoted by Father Puller giving the translation in the words of the latter. He says, "That what is now known as reservation of the elements was practised in the early church there is abundant evidence to show. . . . So Jerome speaks of Exuperius carrying the Lord's Body in a wicker basket, His Blood in a vessel of glass." I have thought it worth while to draw attention to this because the previous owner of my copy has heavily scored the mistranslated passage, being ignorant, apparently, of the earlier with its accompanying note.

Yours faithfully,

GERARD BALL.

S. RAPHAEL'S LODGE, TORQUAY,
November 13, 1924.

SIR,

As one who cannot claim any special knowledge of liturgical matters, but only the practical experience of having used a Liturgy day by day for a number of years, I venture to plead that the findings of liturgical experts, such as Bishop Knight quotes in your December issue, are not necessarily the final word concerning liturgical matters. For the interest of the liturgical scholar is apt to confine itself excessively to the historical and antiquarian side and to leave out of account the actual effect of the Liturgy in use. The man who uses the Liturgy day by day may claim to have something also to say which may be of service to the full consideration of the question.

It may be a fact of historical interest that at the first the whole of the service was meant to be audible to the people. It may also be the fact that the motive for the change to a certain degree of silence in the Liturgy was merely the low one of convenience, if it is a low one. I can illustrate my doubt regarding the legitimate place of convenience in this way. I once applied—unsuccessfully—for a Minor Canonry in one of the largest of our cathedrals. I was told beforehand that it would be impossible for me to fast if I were celebrant at the Sung Eucharist which, happily in that cathedral, has long been the chief service of Sunday, as the effort to sing it in so large a building would be too much for one fasting. Now the Roman Catholics have many cathedrals as large, but the celebrant has so much less to sing, and so there is never any question of his ability to fast. Now I do not, of course, dispute the facts given by experts like the

late Mr. Edmund Bishop and the late Dr. Fortescue. But from other sides, and taking other factors into consideration, one may welcome the changes, at any rate the periods of silence introduced into the action of the Mass. For the Mass is not only the dramatized Gospel, it is also the epitome of all prayer. The highest form of prayer is the silent, wordless prayer of the more advanced Mystics. So that it seems to me more than a fortunate accident, or a mere concession to convenience, that a place should have been found for such prayer on the part of the congregation assisting in the celebration of the holiest of all the Mysteries. The seemly vestments in which the celebrant is clad are, we are told, the survival of the ordinary evening dress of the Roman gentleman. Here, again, we have an instance of a happening which appears quite casual, but which surely had a sound instinct behind it. Not even in the most ultra-Nonconformist chapels does the celebrant appear in contemporary evening dress.

Then, with regard to the simplicity of the original Roman rite, let us grant it; it is commonly advanced, in the matter of ceremonial, as an argument for the commendation of the Roman Use as against the Use of Dr. Dearmer or of Sarum. But, while granting the effectiveness of the argument, one may take the question further back and ask whether simplicity is necessarily admirable. The woad of our primitive British forefathers was admittedly simple as a mode of dress. All the same, a more elaborate costume is commonly reckoned an improvement. The simplicity of the Roman rite happened to suit the character of the Roman people, simple even to bareness. It would equally well have suited the Spartans. But is there nothing to be said for the more elaborate grace of Athens? Certainly the world of thought and of art has owed an unpayable debt to Athens, while it owes nothing to Sparta. It seems to me to be yet another instance of the soundness of the Christian instinct, which enriched the primitive Roman rite with elements drawn from other and more æsthetic sources. Are we not abundantly familiar with the barest rite in Christendom which can be called a rite at all? And has not our Catholic instinct once again driven us to its enrichment?

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD Ll. LANGFORD JAMES, D.D.

ST. JAMES'S VICARAGE,
EDGBASTON, BIRMINGHAM,
December 9, 1924.

DEAR SIR,

May I give another illustration of Otto's *mysterium tremendum et fascinans?* It is quoted from the *Idler* of about 1895 by Sir William Ramsay in his little book, *The Education of Christ*, pp. 9 *ff.* The writer of the passage, describing from experience the life of a cowboy on the prairies, wrote as follows:

"Two days ago he was riding back, alone, in the afternoon, from an unsuccessful search after strayed horses, and suddenly, all in the lifting of a hoof, the weird prairie had gleamed into eerie life, had dropped the veil and spoken to him; while the breeze stopped, and the sun stood still for a flash in waiting for his answer. And he, his heart in a grip of ice, the frozen flesh acrawl with terror upon his loosened bones, white-lipped and wide-eyed with frantic fear, uttered a yell of horror as he dashed the spurs into his panic-stricken horse, in a mad endeavour to escape from

the Awful Presence that filled all the earth and sky from edge to edge of vision.

"Then, almost in the same flash, the unearthly light died out of the dim prairie, the veil swept across the place again; and he managed to check his wild flight, and look about him. His lips were jibbering without a sound escaping them, his very heart shivered with cold, for all the brassy heat of the day. But the breeze was wandering on again; under the great sun the prairie spread dim to the south-west, and tawny to the north-east; only between his own loose knees the horse trembled in every limb, and mumbled the bit with dry mouth. . . . It was as if his spirit stood apart from him, putting questions which he could not answer, and demanding judgment upon problems which he dare not reason out.

"Then he remembered what this thing was which had happened. The prairie had spoken to him. . . . It was something well known amongst them, but known without words, and as by a subtle instinct, for no man who had experienced it ever spoke willingly about it afterwards. Only the man would be changed; some began to be more reckless, as if a dumb blasphemy rankled hidden in their breasts. Others, coming with greater strength perhaps to the ordeal, became quieter, looking squarely at any danger as they faced it, but continuing ahead as though quietly confident that nothing happened save as the gods ordained."

MAURICE FROST.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

Mark x. 45; *Matt.* xx. 28.—*ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.*

Great doctrinal superstructures have been built upon this. Some try to sap their foundation by denying the authenticity of the saying, in which they find a reflection of later Christian thought. But without reason. There is no textual doubt, and the reminiscence in 1 Tim. ii. 6 affords very early corroboration. "Son of man" is characteristic of Jesus, and very rare later. Moreover, this saying affords the best explanation of the early and widespread reliance on Isa. liii., found in New Testament writers. The dominating idea of sacrifice in ancient religious thought made it inevitable that Jesus should view His own death as such, and His emphasis on the final Passover proves that He did (*cf.* Mark xiv. 24-5; Luke xxii. 15-6; 1 Cor. xi. 26). The difficulty lies in *ἀντὶ*; nowhere else in the New Testament is it used with Christ's death. He is said to die *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* or *ὑπὲρ πάντων*, as in the closely related saying in Mark xiv. 24, which, following so soon, only heightens the contrast of *ἀντὶ* here. Union with Christ, not antithesis or substitution, is certainly the way of redemption, and this is equally the point of view of Jesus and His disciples (*cf.* John xv. 4-6; Rom. vi. 3-11).

But *is* there a difficulty? The sentence ends with the adjectival *πολλῶν* used substantivally; if the implied substantive were expressed, what would it be? The universal assumption seems to be *ἀνθρώπων*. But why not rather *λύτρων*? True, an Attic writer, if he meant this, would have expressed it a little differently, perhaps *δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ πολλῶν λύτρων*, or else *δ.τ.ψ.α.ἐν λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*; but Mark was

certainly no Atticist, and there seems no difficulty in supposing that the saying, originally Aramaic, was rendered into colloquial Greek by Peter or Mark in this way. So taken ἀντὶ has its full force, and instead of importing substitutionary doctrines alien to early Christian thought, it only brings out the profound truth that the Son of man, in consecrating Himself to His Father's service even unto death, gave His own life as the one perfect offering instead of all the many lesser ones by which men had sought to render sacrifice or win redemption. Here is the whole teaching of the prophets (*e.g.*, Mic. vi. 6-8), and the whole argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews on true sacrifice (in the tenth chapter), condensed into one sentence, which utters the very "mind of Christ." Thus understood the saying becomes a most striking example—τῆς ἁπλότητος καὶ τῆς ἁγνότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν χριστόν.

This interpretation is confirmed by 1 Tim. ii. 6 (ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων), which can be nothing but an echo of the Lord's saying. Here the thought expressed is St. Paul's own; and, speaking of Christ's death in relation to our redemption, he quite rightly says ὑπὲρ πάντων, since it is characteristic of Christian faith to hold that the Saviour died on behalf not of some, whether many or few, but of all. Yet while ὑπὲρ rightly and necessarily replaces ἀντὶ in this connection, the reminiscence of the Lord's saying has kept the preposition combined with λύτρον in a single word, and the ἀντίλυτρον resulting expresses by itself, or rather coupled with ἑαυτόν, the whole of τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν λύτρων. Stronger confirmation could hardly be desired; and if we had not the Lord's original saying it would have been almost impossible to see the full meaning of the Apostle's phrase.

It may be thought that the masculine πολλοῖς . . . πολλοὺς . . . πολλῶν . . . in Isa. liii. 11-12 (Sept.) determines πολλῶν as masculine in Mark x. 45. But there is no direct quotation, which weakens any force in this consideration. Besides which it is countered by the neuter ἀνθ ὧν in the same passage. In this prophecy ἀντὶ occurs thrice, but never with πολλῶν; and wherever "we" or "you" or "my people" are referred to, other prepositions are always employed (*cf.* verses 4, 5, 6, 8, 12). It would seem, then, that any comparison of Isa. liii. which is not merely superficial bears out by the very phraseology the foregoing interpretation rather than that which is prevalent. Meantime this falls in much better with the context in the Gospel. The rivalry among disciples was what the Lord was rebuking, and He did this by showing them that the highest ideal was that of service, which He made His own. But the thought of service passes into that of consecration, and so into that of sacrifice; so the whole life which serves others, serves God, and is consecrate to Him, becoming one single offering which supersedes the lesser gifts that many have brought to God so often (*cf.* Rom. xii. 1).

E. P. Boys-Smith.

REVIEW

Christian Beginnings. Three lectures by F. C. Burkitt, D.D. University of London Press. 4s. 6d.

These three lectures contain a series of brilliant suggestions, with special reference to the two volumes of Professors Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake which appeared in 1920 and 1922. It is, of course, impossible to touch on all the points raised by the versatility of Professor Burkitt when he is out to interest an intelligent audience, and has at least three hours at his disposal. We can only mention a few of the most salient and striking. His first suggestion, that but for one verse of St. Matthew we should think of John rather as a moralist than a Baptist or Eschatologist, is an admirable introduction to the subject based on right insistence on the scholar's duty now to begin his study from St. Mark and Q. It must, of course, be worked out in connection with the whole of the subject. A warning against the danger of overestimating the importance of the Messianic element in any study of "Beginnings" is timely and provocative. The facts about the title "Son of Man" have seldom been better summarized. Insistence on the difficulty of supposing that the whole association of suffering with this Figure is merely a literary device, is the kind of criticism of Jackson and Lake's work that will help forward study rather than prejudice. Of equal value is the Professor's discussion of the date of entrance into Christian thought of ideas connected with the Suffering Servant of Isaiah. Perhaps here two criticisms may be permitted. Dr. Burkitt finds it difficult to suppose that Hebrew Christian thought could have applied the title "Ebed Jahveh" to Christ. It must have been the Greeks, acquainted with the LXX translation παῖς, who first used it. Is this really based on the connotation of the title in Hebrew thought, or have modern ideas about slavery anything to do with the difficulty? Secondly, does it suggest to Hebrew thought anything which makes it difficult to suppose that the Lord could have applied it to Himself? May we not suppose that the Lord learned from Isaiah as from other Scripture, and that what He learned and taught from the passages which describe the Suffering Servant fell on unwilling ears, but has left its trace on early and trustworthy tradition? In the light of Calvary and Easter its importance and significance were seen, and Christian thought, even Jewish Christian thought, may soon have been busy with a type of thought which during His life on earth had been neither welcomed nor understood.

The whole discussion of names and titles is fresh and illuminating. Dr. Burkitt's suggestion as to the effect of the Resurrection on the disciples' use of κύριος, or its Semitic equivalent *Mari*, in opposition to Bousset's theory of Antioch and Greek influence, calls for consideration.

In the second lecture the most striking and interesting points have to do with the story of St. James. We notice particularly the suggestion that the Greek Church of Aelia Capitolina made her own the traditions of the old Jerusalem Church, so that they give us much that is in substance historical, though it is expressed in Greek in terms which show the use of the Greek and not the Hebrew Old Testament. This theory is extended to explain the Epistle which bears the name of St. James, the Lord's Brother, and yet in many ways is indubitably Greek: a valuable suggestion which may carry on beyond its immediate application. It suggests the possibility, within definable limits, that other records which are Greek in present form may be Semitic in substantial contents. Another important question is raised in this lecture, the scene of the earliest appearances of the Risen Lord. Professor Burkitt maintains the historical value of the Lucan record. His contrast of the sobriety of St. Luke with the license of other writings, like the *Pistis Sophia* of Gnostic origin, or the more orthodox *Epistola Apostolorum*, recently discovered, in which no scruple is felt by the writers in making the Risen Christ a mouthpiece for their views, will be useful to many who cannot follow him in his identification of the appearance to the five hundred, mentioned by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 6, with the events of the day of Pentecost. (Those of us who have spent our lives in trying to say the same sort of thing are grateful to Dr. Burkitt for saying it now so much better and more convincingly.) His words, introduced here to deal faithfully with the prejudice against the historical trustworthiness of the Acts, raised by those who, like Jackson and Lake,* discredit the Jerusalem appearances, have wider significance than their original content. (It may be that the "Galilean" period of earliest Church history is a bubble that will soon burst.)

The third lecture contains many happy suggestions as to the probable course of early Christian history, if we follow the guidance, all we have got, or nearly all, of the early chapters of the Acts, aptly termed "Scenes from early days," a historical impression, "but a sketch, not a history." The relation of such impressions to the evidence of the Pauline Epistles is discussed, and many suggestions about the right interpretation of their content result. One in particular deserves attention.

* *Beginnings*, vol. i., p. 203 and note.

The salutations of most of the Pauline Epistles suggest joint authorship. Dr. Burkitt suggests that we should take this fact seriously when we have to deal with matter in these epistles which it is difficult to fit into the general scheme of St. Paul's thought. The third lecture, like the others, is full of brilliant and useful suggestions. Dr. Burkitt shows us how to think, and also how to seek and find. He leaves us to do the rest of the work. He will never tell us "what to believe," and then let us go to sleep.

A. E. Brooke.

NOTICES

Idealism as a Philosophical Doctrine, by R. F. A. Hoernlé, Hodder and Stoughton, 5s.

This book is probably as good an introduction to the subject as is to be found anywhere. The style is clear, precise, and highly polished. Technical terms are only sparingly used, and when introduced are usually explained. The non-philosophical reader will find little difficulty in understanding the main drift of the book. Its most valuable feature is its careful and discriminating criticism of Berkeley, with whom the author is always in close sympathy, even when not in philosophic agreement. He divides idealists into two great classes: spiritual pluralists, like Berkeley, who regard reality as a society of ultimately distinct personal spirits, and absolutists or spiritual monists who reduce individual personality to mere "appearance," and regard "reality" as consisting in the last resort of only a single spiritual being. Of the absolutists he regards Kant and Hegel as the typical representatives. He is probably right about Hegel; but Kant seems so distinctly to have held that human souls are substances distinct both from one another and from God, that if he is to be regarded as an idealist at all (which is somewhat doubtful), his place seems clearly to be with Berkeley and the pluralists. The stress which he lays upon the immortality of the human soul cannot be reconciled with absolutism. The fact that Hegel and others have "developed" Kant's doctrine in the absolutist direction is no good reason for calling the founder of modern critical philosophy an absolutist.

Mr. Hoernlé shows profound admiration for the Neo-Hegelianism of Mr. Bradley, but usually follows Dr. Bosanquet in the matters in which these two philosophers differ. He is much more at home in philosophy than in theology; indeed, his treatment of theological questions is in all cases inadequate, and usually out of harmony with Christian tradition. Christian theism, he considers, involves logical contradictions, and therefore cannot be ultimately true: "God, as both Bradley and Bosanquet agree, is an 'appearance,' though ranking high in the order of appearances. Or, to put this verdict in less technical language, to conceive reality as God is a way of thinking which has a high degree of truth, but which under philosophic criticism turns out still to be inadequate to the nature of reality as a whole. In other words, the concept of person and personal intercourse on which pluralism relies seems to the absolutist as untenable, if taken as ultimate truth." His language about human immortality is vague. Upon the whole he seems to regard a future life

as doubtful and hardly desirable. He defines religion as "faith in the conservation of values" rather than in the conservation of persons. A man's "personal survival does not matter if but the cause for which he cares above all else prevails."

This book would have been strengthened by some reply to the severe criticisms to which idealism has lately been subjected by the rising schools of modern realism. He makes a very brief reference to the realist arguments of Mr. Russell and Dr. Alexander, but he has nothing to say about the far more important criticisms of the idealist position by the Neo-scholastics, Mr. Case, and above all Professor Cook Wilson, who has trained so many of the present Oxford "greats" tutors.

CHARLES HARRIS.

BOOK NOTES

Buddhism and Buddhists in China. By Lewis Hodous, D.D. The Macmillan Co. 6s. This slim volume is one of a series entitled "The World's Living Religions," the purpose of which is "impressionistic rather than definitely educational." The impression of Chinese Buddhism conveyed by Dr. Hodous is accurate and vivid, and may be commended as a very interesting introduction to the subject. The final chapter contains an admission which is a challenge to the missionary zeal of those who stand for the sacramental life of the Church. The writer says that in the past the emphasis has been to a large extent "doctrinal, moral and individual. The result has been a body of people free from gross sins, but also innocent of the great virtues and individualistic in their outlook upon this world and the next. This emphasis is needed, but in addition there should be the cultivation of the presence of God in the soul by appropriate means." *Finding God.* By Russell Henry Stafford. The Macmillan Co. 7s. It is the contention of the author that "reason freed in the atmosphere of moral enthusiasm will more eagerly seek and sooner reach its goal of perfect truth than under the galling fetters of self-regarding authority, now happily loosed and discarded." Writing as a professed "liberal" who, having come through a "painful and morally perilous period of radical doubt," has small regard for the Church with its creeds and sacramental system, he yet presents Christ understandingly and persuasively as the incarnate Son of God and as the true Way to the Father, and urges men of enquiring mind to the life of discipleship with the sacrifice which is involved in it. One is compelled to ask what form the association of those who respond is expected to take. Or is there no natural compulsion of association in their Christian profession? *The Discovery of God.* By Basil King. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d. The discoverers are Abraham, Jacob, Moses, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Jesus, and their contributions are dealt with in a series of chapters which present an unduly simplified sketch of progressive revelation among the Jews. As to our Lord and His "discovery" of the Universal Father, "there was nothing final" in His work. "Those who called themselves by His Name were to overtake Him—*and go further*": and "no one's bit of struggle need ever be in vain. Coming out of it a stronger man than when he went in, he adds by so much a little to our racial discovery of God." There is religion in the book, and there is a spiritual version of social evolution: but the Christian religion is not found. *Frederick Edward Ridgeway, Bishop of*

Salisbury: A Memoir. By Ernest Cross. With Foreword by the Lord Bishop of London. Mowbrays. 6s. The late Bishop of Salisbury's domestic chaplain gives in brief compass "a true and faithful record of fact" concerning the life of one whose earnestness and devotion and practical ability as priest and bishop won him many friends. Three portraits and six of the bishop's addresses add considerably to the value of a book which is sympathetic, revealing, and workmanlike. *Spiritual Letters of Richard Meux Benson.* Selected and Edited by W. H. Longridge. Mowbrays. 2s. 6d. In honour of the centenary of Father Benson's birthday, the editor has made a selection from the two volumes of his letters published in 1916 and 1920, prefacing the extracts with a memorial sermon preached by Bishop Gore. The work has been exceedingly well done, and the book is a golden treasury of devotional reading which will be valued by all who desire to deepen their spiritual life. *Tests of Vocation: and other Addresses.* By the late W. M. G. Ducat, Archdeacon of Berkshire. Edited with a Brief Memoir by Canon A. R. Whitham. Longmans. 3s. 6d. These addresses breathe the quiet power of the prayerful life, and, as the Bishop of Oxford says in his Foreword, "will tell to those who come after us what Cuddesdon teaches and stands for." The book is one for the priest to keep by him for use at Embertide, when he seeks to get back in simple and direct fashion to the big things that underlie his ministry. *Will Men be Like Gods? Humanitarianism or Human Happiness?* By Owen Francis Dudley. Introduction by G. K. Chesterton. Longmans. 2s. and 3s. 6d. Father Dudley's popular exposure of the inadequacy of the humanitarian ideals of Mr. H. G. Wells and others makes highly entertaining reading, even for what he calls the "Protestant clergyman." It is a vigorous and effective treatment, from the Catholic standpoint, of the present dangerous movement away from the Church towards an earthly Utopia. *The Romanticism of St. Francis, and other Studies in the Genius of the Franciscans.* By Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. 2nd edition. Longmans. 10s. 6d. The second edition of this important work, supplementing the writer's well-known *Life of St. Francis of Assisi,* appears with various emendations and additions in the studies originally included, and with a new essay in appreciation of Adam Marsh, "one of the outstanding figures in the history of the early English Franciscans." In this interesting additional paper Father Cuthbert shows a thirteenth-century scholar Franciscan living in full loyalty to the ideals of the Order; and he suggests that "much has been written undiscerningly regarding the repugnance of St. Francis to the acquirement of learning amongst the brethren." He asserts that "it was not study, but the secular ambition to rival other Orders, and, in particular, the Dominicans, which was the primal cause of the decline." *A Little Anthology of the Holy Eucharist.* Compiled by Olive M. Hardy. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d. This delightful little book will be of value to the newly confirmed as an introduction to the wealth of privilege open to them in the Blessed Sacrament; it will serve the experienced communicant as a generous basis of devout and joyous meditation; and to the priest it will furnish many suggestions for devotional addresses to the faithful, in addition to helping his own inner life. Extracts are provided from writers of East and West, of all ages of the Church's history, and of catholic diversity; and all are conveniently grouped under seven headings, an index of authors being provided.

O. H.

Pagan and Christian Rule. By H. G. Bevenot. Longmans. 5s. This well-written book, by a German Benedictine who has very nearly mastered the English language, is definitely a thesis, an attractive presentation of carefully selected facts, rather than a historical work. The thesis is that the high-water mark of Christian civilization was reached in the thirteenth century, when the Church's supremacy was readily granted. In the face of modern disintegration a return to the Church is imperative, if we are not to witness a "downfall of the West" parallel to that of the fifth century, which will leave us worse off than the world was under pagan rule. Mr. Hilaire Belloc contributes a characteristic preface. We are grateful for evidential books which describe the *Gesta Christi* in and through the Church. But this particular book compares unfavourably with Mr. Mozley's little work *The Achievements of Christianity*, and is not likely to convince a critical reader. Is it fair to claim for the Church all that was good in the thirteenth century, and assign the evil to the State or to pagan tendencies against which the Church ineffectually contended? Of slavery Dom Bevenot says the Church "tolerated the institution for a time." In the Middle Ages "millionaires would have been impossibilities"; but men whose relative income and power over the lives of others exceeded that of millionaires to-day abounded. "The Albigenses were the Mormons of that time" is a too summary judgment. The following judgment is curious: (for certain offenders) "the penalty of having melted lead poured down their throats was decreed. Another sign of progress . . ." *The Message of Francis of Assisi.* By H. F. B. Mackay. S.S.P.P. 4s. 6d. Preb. Mackay retells the deathless story so gracefully and with such restraint that one grudges him to All Saints, Margaret Street. Why should one congregation have a monopoly of such talents? Why does not the author of these delightful sketches write real books? Perhaps his attempt to imagine Francis in modern Oxford is less successful than the rest of the book, but the attempt was worth making. *Literary Genius of the Old Testament.* By F. C. Sands. Oxford Press. 4s. 6d. This is a school book of an unusual kind. The author, who is headmaster of Pocklington School, takes his elder boys through the Old Testament in a series of lessons, pointing out the various literary types to be found there. The expression work includes such tasks as telling the story of Henry II. and Thomas of Canterbury in the style of the Joseph stories. It is good to think that such admirable lessons are being given in schools. *Early Hebrew History.* By H. M. Wiener. R. Scott. 5s. Mr. Wiener is well known by his articles and books on the Divine Names in the Hebrew Bible as a redoubtable champion of the conservative position. In the present book he assumes the results of his previous work. The legislation of the Pentateuch is treated as coming from Moses. One specimen of Mr. Wiener's arguments must suffice. Laymen were allowed to offer sacrifices by Exod. xx. 24-26. "It was found by experience that, in practice, offerings were made to the satyrs; and accordingly it was provided that the law of Exodus should be suspended for the desert period (Lev. xvii. 1-7). This is a very strong instance, for it shows that Moses did not hesitate to suspend his own laws when he found them working badly" (p. 57). All the inconsistencies of the Pentateuch could be explained on this principle, and Higher Critics reduced to silence. When Mr. Wiener discusses the historical books he adopts a radical position. The editors have distorted

history in accordance with their later standpoint; for example, the story of Naboth is not historical. The well-known difficulty of reconciling the legal system presupposed in the historical books with the Pentateuch is met by a theory of royal prerogative, the Kings having power to change the Law. When Mr. Wiener attacked critical reconstructions he delivered some shrewd blows, and Dr. Skinner published an exhaustive reply. His own constructive work will probably not attract attention. *Holy Marriage.* By O. D. Watkins. Faith Press. 2s. 6d. The author of an exhaustive work on Matrimony here gives a brief summary of his results. Father Bull of Cowley has prepared the book for the press. Needless to say, it is a useful companion for the priest, though from a literary standpoint unattractive. *For a Three Years' Course of Sermons.* By A. T. Fryer. Faith Press. 4s. 6d. The publisher announces these sermon notes as "a book which every parson wants." If he does want another's sermon notes, he will find here a great deal of good sense and wide reading. The references to books are not always wisely chosen, being apparently to those on the writer's shelves, and to back numbers of periodicals. It is ungrateful to complain when so many are to THEOLOGY, but the inaccessibility of the books recommended, some of them out of print, is a drawback. *Personal Idealism and Mysticism.* By W. R. Inge, D.D. Longmans. 5s. These very attractive lectures first published in 1907, have now reached a third edition. In a new preface the Dean says: "My contention was, and still is, that Platonism cannot be torn out of Christianity without destroying it"; and: "The deliberate acceptance of irrationalism, against which I protested eighteen years ago, has proceeded further since I wrote." *This—to Explain.* By Kenneth Ingram. S.S.P.P. 2s. A charmingly written description of the inner life of one who accepts the Catholic devotional system in its entirety. Such a one is a Catholic, over against the mass of the non-Catholic world. The author probably understands that he is describing what is for the most part an ideal rather than a reality. He does not reckon with the existence of those who, having tried the full system recommended by him, have abandoned much of it, and yet are not conscious of having become less Catholic.

W. K. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER